OxMorph1

-

First Oxford Workshop on Romance Verb Morphology

University of Oxford

27 – 28 August 2008 at Trinity College

Organised by
Maria Goldbach, Marc-Olivier Hinzelin, Martin Maiden & John Charles Smith

Arts & Humanities
Research Council

University of Oxford
Faculty of Medieval and Modern Languages
Research project "Autonomous Morphology in Diachrony:
comparative evidence from the Romance languages"

FIRST OXFORD WORKSHOP ON ROMANCE VERB MORPHOLOGY
–
OXMORPH1

27-Aug-2008 – 28-Aug-2008 at Trinity College, Oxford, UK

Meeting Email: oxmorph [at] mod-langs.ox.ac.uk

Website:
http://www.mod-langs.ox.ac.uk/romance-morphology/workshops/oxmorph1.html

Conference Fee: £ 35.

Venue: **Danson Room, Trinity College**, Broad Street, Oxford, OX1 3BH
(Phone +44 (0)1865 279900)

Poster Session: **Room 2, Taylor Institution Library**, St Giles', Oxford
OX1 3NA

Organised by
Maria Goldbach, Marc-Olivier Hinzelin, Martin Maiden & John Charles Smith

Arts & Humanities
Research Council

PROGRAMME

FIRST OXFORD WORKSHOP ON ROMANCE VERB MORPHOLOGY – OXMORPH1

Venue: Danson Room, Trinity College, Broad Street, Oxford, OX1 3BH,
Poster Session: Room 2, Taylor Institution Library, St Giles', Oxford OX1 3NA

Wednesday, 27 August

10.00 – 10.05 am	**Opening**
10.05 – 11.00 am	Martin Maiden (Trinity College, Oxford) "Morphomes and 'phonologically conditioned allomorphy'"
11.05 – 12.00 pm	Stephen R. Anderson (Yale U, New Haven) "Stress-conditioned allomorphy in Surmiran (Rumantsch)"
12.05 – 1.00 pm	Mark Aronoff (SUNY Stony Brook) & Zheng Xu (NU Singapore) "Affix ordering and morph selection"
1.00 – 2.30 pm	**Lunch** at the *Kings Arms (40 Holywell Street)*
2.30 – 3.25 pm	Max W. Wheeler (Sussex) "The evolution of a morphome in Catalan verb inflection, with evidence from a medieval corpus"
3.35 – 4.30 pm	Paul O'Neill (Linacre College, Oxford) "Morphomes, morphemes, and morphological segmentation"
4.30 – 5.00 pm	**Tea**
5.00 – 5.55 pm	Maria Goldbach (Oxford) "Paradigmatic properties of the *e-* and *i-*class verbs in Spanish with a comparison with other Ibero-Romance variants"
6.15 – 7.45 pm	**POSTER SESSION** at the **Taylor Institution, Room 2** (with drinks served) *List of Posters, see page 5.*
8.00 pm	**Dinner** at *Al-Shami* Lebanese Restaurant 25 Walton Crescent, Oxford (Phone +44 1865 310066)

Thursday, 28 August

9.00 – 9.05 am	*Opening*

9.05 – 10.00 am — John Charles Smith (St Catherine's College, Oxford)
"*Et in Acadia ego...* – Reflections on person and tense in (mainly Canadian) French"

10.00 – 10.30 am — *Coffee*

10.30 – 11.25 am — Michele Loporcaro (Zürich)
"Syncretism in the marking of Romance object agreement"

11.35 – 12.30 pm — Andrew Swearingen (St Catherine's College, Oxford)
"The Romance imperative, irregular morphology, and the morphome"

12.30 – 2.10 pm — *Lunch* at *Trinity College* (by invitation only)

2.10 – 3.05 pm — Marc-Olivier Hinzelin (Keble College, Oxford)
"Syncretism and suppletion in Gallo-Romance verb paradigms"

3.15 – 4.10 pm — Vito Pirrelli (Pisa)
"Morphology learning as paradigm learning: developmental and computational evidence from Romance languages"

4.10 – 4.40 pm — *Tea*

4.40 – 5.35 pm — Nigel Vincent (Manchester)
"Non-finite forms and the paradigm in Latin and (Italo-)Romance"

5.35 – 6.15 pm — Closure: General Review

7.15 pm — *Dinner* at *St Catherine's College* (by invitation only)
Manor Road, Oxford (Phone +44 1865 271700)

POSTER SESSION
at the **Taylor Institution, Room 2** (with drinks served)

Wednesday, 27 August, 6.15 – 7.45 pm

Posters by

Montserrat Adam-Aulinas (U Barcelona)
"The paradigmatic importance of velar extension for the maintenance or change
of north-east Catalan verb forms during the 20th century"

Angelo Costanzo (OSU, Columbus)
"On the expansion and productivity of a Balkan Romance conjugational sub-class"

Sascha Gaglia (Konstanz)
"Metaphony, the status of word-final vowels, and autonomous morphology:
evidence from Italo-Romance"

Judith Meinschaefer (Würzburg)
"The interface of morphology and phonology in the light of accentual patterns
in Spanish and Italian verb forms"

Cinzia Russi (U Texas, Austin)
"Clitics of Italian *verbi procomplementari*: what are they?"

Catherine Taylor (Essex)
"Periphrasis in Romance verbs"

Anna M. Thornton (Aquila)
"A non-canonical phenomenon in Italian verb morphology:
double forms realizing the same cell"

Jesse Tseng (Toulouse)
"Reanalysis of final consonants in French verb + pronoun sequences"

***The paradigmatic importance of velar extension
for the maintenance or change of north-east Catalan verb forms
during the twentieth century***

Montserrat Adam-Aulinas (Universitat de Barcelona)

Velar extension is a formal element /g/ which is found in some places of the verbal paradigm as a simple distribution morph, without any meaning. It first appeared in Catalan verbs in the Middle Ages. Today's standard Catalan has velar extension in verbs of subclass [II, + ext.] (e.g. *beure* 'to drink) – and in some other verbs (e.g. *tenir* 'to have') – in several tenses and persons: PI (1) [= present indicative], PS (1, 2, 3, 6) [= present subjunctive], IS [= imperfect subjunctive], participle, and perfect simple. In today's dialectal varieties, velar extension is also found in other verb classes and in other tenses of subclass [II, +ext.].

Our analysis centres on the linguistic change which occurred during the twentieth century in the six characteristics of dialectal verb morphology of north-east Catalan that are related to velar extension – either because it is this feature that makes them dialectal, or because it is the form of standard Catalan that has spread and replaced the dialectal features. We will base our study on two oral corpora: Alcover's (1906-1928) corpus and our own, from data gathered in 1999 and 2000.

The data were studied by grouping together all the region's dialectal verb characteristics (both those related to velar extension and others unrelated to it) according to what we call "spatial type", which considers the geographical distribution of the characteristics inside the area and in the surrounding dialects (in order to compare homogeneous data, since this typological factor may also have affected the development of the characteristics).

The characteristics that we analyse in relation to velar extension are listed here:

A) Presence of velar extension in the dialectal forms corresponding to:
- 4, 5 PI of the subclass [II, +ext.] (= *characteristic 1*) [Spatial type IIa]
- IS and 4, 5 PS of class III (= *char. 2*) [Spatial type III]
- 1 PI of *anar* 'to go', *fer* 'to make', *haver* 'to have', *veure* 'to see' (= *char. 3*) [Spatial type IIc]
- PS (1, 2, 3, 6) of *anar*, *fer*, *haver*, *veure* (= *char. 4*) [Spatial type IV]

B) Substitution of the dialectal forms by those of standard Catalan which include velar extension, corresponding to:
- 1PI of the verb *ser* 'to be' (= *char. 5*) [Spatial type I]
- 1PI of the verbs of the subclass [II, +ext.] (= *char. 6*) [Spatial type I]

The results show that: (a) in the case of spatial type I, the dialectal forms without velar extension which were being replaced by standard Catalan forms with velar extension (*char. 5* and *6*) have lost more territory and percentage of use than those replaced by a rival standard Catalan form that did not include velar extension; (b) in the case of spatial type IIa, for the dialectal form with velar extension (*char. 1*) we find an increase in the territory and the percentage of use; (c) in the case of spatial types III and IV, the dialectal characteristics with velar extension (*char. 2* and *4*) have maintained their territory – unlike the rest of characteristics of this type, which had lost ground; (d) finally, with regard to spatial type IIb, there has only been a slight

reduction in the territory in which characteristic 3 was used (note that this characteristic could be considered either as velar extension or as epithesis).
So the force of the verbal paradigm – and, more specifically, the pressure of the velar extension /g/ – remains active in Catalan. This has been shown by the examination of the change or maintenance of the dialectal verb forms of the north-eastern variety of the language during the twentieth century.

Stress-conditioned allomorphy in Surmiran (Rumantsch)
Stephen R. Anderson (Yale University, New Haven, CT)

An extensive system of stress-conditioned vowel alternations has developed in the history of this form of Rumantsch from purely phonological status to that of phonologically conditioned allomorphy.
This has resulted from the emergence of significant opacity in the original pattern, a consequence both of the cumulative effects of other phonological changes and of the introduction of many loan words, especially from German. Synchronically, Surmiran stems must in general have two listed forms, one used when primary stress falls on the last vowel of the stem and the other when this vowel will not bear primary stress. This pattern is most thoroughly exemplified in the verbal system, but in this talk I will discuss its effects elsewhere in the morphology, responding in part to comments by Maiden on earlier presentations of the system. Of particular interest are the facts concerning words whose base contains only a single stem form, as opposed to the stress-based alternating patterns seen elsewhere.

Affix ordering and morph selection
Mark Aronoff (SUNY Stony Brook) & Zheng Xu (NU Singapore)

This paper presents an inferential-realizational model of inflectional morphology within Optimality Theory (OT) and argues for its advantages over other morphological frameworks. Following Russell (1995), Yip (1998), Hyman (2003), and MacBride (2004), we assume that the phonological information of inflectional affixes, clitics, and function words is introduced through realization constraints (RCs) which associate morphosyntactic feature values with phonological forms. We show that this model readily captures language phenomena such as affix ordering and avoidance of repetition of identical morphs.
Crosslinguistically, a morphosyntactically less specific form often emerges to replace a morphosyntactically more specific form when the more specific form would be adjacent to a phonologically (partially) identical form. In Standard Spanish, the clitic *lo* is a marker for third person (3) singular non-reflexive masculine direct object and *le* realizes {3, sg, non-reflexive, object}. *Se* can be a third person reflexive clitic, either singular or plural, or an impersonal pronoun. When *le* is expected to be adjacent to a clitic beginning with *l*, it is replaced by *se*, which is the default clitic (e.g. *Juan se (*le) lo dio.* 'John gave it/him to him/her.') (Perlmutter 1971). A similar phenomenon is found in Greek, Hungarian, and Tswana.

Two OT approaches have been proposed to capture the above phenomena. Grimshaw (2001) proposes an alignment-based approach to the Spanish spurious *se* rule within an OT model based on the generation of morphosyntactic feature values. Under this approach, both the input and output are composed of morphosyntactic feature value sets. The output candidate {-ref, 3, sg, dative} + {-ref, 3, sg, acc(usative)} (i.e. *le lo*) is ruled out by the constraint Person Right, which requires a person marker to appear at the rightmost edge. The winning candidate {+ref} + {-ref, 3, sg, acc} (i.e. *se lo*) satisfies this constraint.

There are several problems for this approach. First, alignment constraints such as Person Right cannot account for cases of avoidance of repetition of identical morphs by suppletion in Greek, Hungarian, and Tswana, in which two phonologically (partially) identical forms do not share any morphosyntactic feature. Second, it is not clear why *se* only realizes {+ref} because it can also be an impersonal pronoun. Last but not least, it is not clear why alignment constraints can work in this model given that there is no phonological form in the output, unless we refer to an extraordinary mechanism such as vocabulary-insertion, which is used in a serial model like Distributed Morphology.

On the other hand, a morphologically restricted OT model (de Lacy 1999, Bonet 2004) would simply stipulate in the input the relation between a morphosyntactically more specific form and a less specific one. For example, this model would assume that the Spanish clitic *le* has priority over *se* in being spelt out and either *le* or *se* will be spelt out, i.e. /{le > se}/. The constraint Priority (Bonet 2004), which is faithful to this stipulation, requires an object on the left of '>' to appear in the output. An OCP constraint which bans the adjacency of two (partially) identical morphs can override Priority to derive *se lo* assuming the input is /{le > se} + lo/.

We show that the above-mentioned problems can be resolved under our realization OT model. We propose the ranking schema OCP >> RC$_{specific}$ >> RC$_{less\ specific}$ and show that it readily captures the above-mentioned language phenomena. To account for the spurious *se* rule in Spanish, we propose the constraint {3, sg, -ref, masc(uline), acc, object}: *lo* (lo), which ranks higher than {3, sg, -ref, object}: *le* (le). We also propose a constraint which requires every feature value to be realized by *se* (se). Assume the input comprises the feature value sets {3, sg, -ref, dative, object} + {3, sg, -ref, masc, acc, object}. The ranking OCP >> lo >> le >> se forces *se* to emerge in this context. The illicit candidate *le lo* is ruled out by OCP and *se le* by the constraint realizing *lo*. The winning output *se lo* satisfies both OCP and lo.

On the expansion and productivity
of a Balkan Romance conjugational sub-class
Angelo Costanzo (The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH)

As in several other Romance languages, the Daco-Romanian 4th conjugation (verbs in *-i* or *-î*) is heavily populated by verbs that show a reflex of the Latin inchoative affix ĪSC/ĒSC as a stem extension in some forms (e.g. *doresc* 'want$_{1SG}$', *iube$şti$* 'love$_{2SG}$', etc.). While many Romanian 4th conjugation verbs follow this conjugational pattern, not all do. For instance, *a dormi* 'sleep$_{INF}$' has *dorm* 'sleep$_{1SG}$', without the affix, rather than *dormesc*. In most descriptions

of the Romanian conjugational class system, *i*-verbs are broken down into two subclasses, one with the reflex of the inchoative affix ([+SC]), and the other without it ([-SC]). Even so, many verbs fluctuate between the subclasses dialectally.

While verbs in the Daco-Romanian [-SC] subclass are predominantly core vocabulary inherited from Latin (e.g. DRmn. *aud* 'hear$_{1SG}$' < Lat. AUDIŌ), the [+SC] subclass is mainly populated by two groups. Many are verbs borrowed from other Balkan languages, mainly S. Slavic (e.g. DRmn. *iubesc* 'love$_{1SG}$' < OCS любити 'love$_{INF}$'). The other main group is made up of denominative verbs formed from nouns/adjectives regardless of origin (e.g. DRmn. *îmbolnăvesc* 'make sick$_{1SG}$' < Bg. болнав 'sick$_{ADJ}$', DRmn. *numesc* 'name$_{1SG}$' < Lat. NOMEN 'name$_{NOUN}$'). This suggests that a similar derivational strategy is responsible for the assimilation of foreign items and the formation of denominative verbs.

However, not all Balkan borrowings fall into the [+SC] class of the 4th conjugation, as a few fall into the [-SC] class or into other conjugational classes altogether. In addition, there is variation across dialects to which class some of these verbs were incorporated into. This variation continues into the contemporary language as well, as shown by forms of recent loans such as *bloguiesc/bloghez* < Eng. *blog*.

In addition, the other Balkan Romance languages (Megleno-Romanian, Istro-Romanian, Aromanian) show basic similarities to Daco-Romanian in regard to this phenomenon, but also differences in terms of the formation, expansion, etc. of the subclasses of their respective 4th conjugation. In addition to the differences observed while comparing this phenomenon across the Balkan Romance family, there is also much variation within these languages themselves (e.g. the differences between Aromanian spoken in Macedonia, Albania and Greece).

The variation is indicative of different models being employed in the assimilation process inasmuch as the expansion of this class is essentially a result of analogical change. When words are borrowed, they must be assimilated to previously established patterns in the recipient language. Moreover, the same analogical processes active in the past remain active, so that as Labov (1994) suggests, we can learn about developments in the past by examining the present.

Selected References

Academia Republicii Populare Romîne (1963): *Gramatica limbii romîne.* Bucureşti: Editura Academia Republicii Populare Romîne

Capidan, Th. (1925): *Meglenoromânii I: Istoria şi graiul lor.* Bucureşti: Cultura Naţionala. [Accessed at http://www.unibuc.ro/CLASSICA/]

Iordan, Iorgu et al. (1967): *Structura Morfologică a limbii române contemporane.* Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică.

Juilland, Alphonse & P.M.H. Edwards (1971): *The Rumanian Verb System*. The Hague: Mouton.

Labov, William (1994): *Principles of Linguistic Change.* Vol. 1. Oxford: Blackwell.

Petrucci, Peter R. (1999): *Slavic Features in the History of Rumanian*. München: Lincom Europa.

Vrabie, Emil (2000): *An English-Aromanian (Macedo-Romanian) Dictionary*. University of Mississippi: Romance Monographs.

Metaphony, the status of word-final vowels, and autonomous morphology: evidence from Italo-Romance
Sascha Gaglia (Universität Konstanz)

We call a morphological constituent autonomous (or a *morphome*) if it it does not serve for the realisation of syntactic or semantic features (Aronoff 1994). This is typically the case for theme vowels in Italian which do not exhibit syntactic or semantic information but the membership of a verb to a conjugational class. On the other hand, constituents which are markers for number, gender, etc. are not autonomous.

The present paper discusses the question whether Italo-Romance metaphony is to be treated as a case of autonomous morphology. Metaphony generally means raising and diphthongisation of stressed mid vowels, originally triggered by word-final *-u* and *-i* (Maiden 1991 among others). For verbs, the phenomenon typically occurs in 2SG. The following examples are taken from a Campanian dialect, which shows metaphonic raising (cf. Gaglia 2007).

Table 1 Metaphony in a Campanian dialect

2SG PRES.IND = *raising*		3SG PRES.IND = *no raising*	
['p**e**rdi]	'you lose'	['p**ɛ**rde]	'he loses'
['m**i**tti]	'you put'	['m**e**tte]	'he puts'
['m**o**ːvi]	'you move'	['m**ɔ**ːve]	'he moves'
['r**u**mbi]	'you destroy'	['r**o**mbe]	'he destroys'

Metaphony has nowadays been morphologised. Dialects differ concerning the relationship between the word-final vowel as an inflectional ending and the raised root-vowel as an exponent of grammatical information. While dialects of TYPE A exhibit metaphony and neutralisation of word-final vowels to *schwa*, TYPE B-dialects show metaphony and their preservation:

Table 2 Metaphony and the status of word-final vowels

TYPE A-DIALECTS	TYPE B-DIALECTS	
['m**i**ttə]	['m**i**tti]	'you put' (2SG PRES.IND)

The following typology will be presented:

TYPE A-DIALECTS: metaphony is not a case of autonomous morphology, since the syntactic and semantic components have to use the grammatical information encoded solely within the root.

TYPE B-DIALECTS: grammatical information is encoded within word-final vowels and, redundantly, within the root. We claim that metaphony in dialects of TYPE B is a case of autonomous morphology, since syntax and semantics do not require grammatical information from the root.

The Campanian dialect mentioned above exhibits a weaker variant of the A-type, since final vowel neutralisation does occur. But it is entirely due to post-lexical phonology (Gaglia 2007), and the person-and-number endings are fully learnable.

Moreover, we discuss if the morphomic characteristics of metaphonic roots are comparable to the ones of theme vowels.

References

Aronoff, M. (1994): *Morphology by itself*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Gaglia, S. (2007): *Metaphonie im kampanischen Dialekt von Piedimonte Matese. Eine Analyse an der Schnittstelle zwischen Phonologie, Morphologie und Lexikon*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Konstanz.

Maiden, M. (1991): *Interactive morphonology. Metaphony in Italy*. London / New York: Routledge.

Paradigmatic properties of the *e*- and *i*-class verbs in Spanish with a comparison with other Ibero-Romance variants

Maria Goldbach (University of Oxford)

The presentation concentrates on the paradigmatic structure of *e*- and *i*-class verbs in Ibero-Romance, mainly in Spanish. At present, it seems that there exists no cross-theoretically accepted definition of the notion of paradigm. And there are many morphologists who dispute the conceptual necessity of this notion. For them, paradigms are the epiphenomenal impression of the coverage of category crossing. It seems reasonable that morphosyntactic categories like Tense, Mood, Person and Number constitute the cornerstones of paradigmatic structure but this is not all. I will illustrate another aspect of paradigmatic structure on the basis of the Spanish verb system, focussing on the verbs of the *e*- and the *i*-class with the highest usage rank.

The descriptive Spanish grammars declare that for Spanish there are 61 forms in which every non-defective verb lexeme may occur. In the *FDSW* none of the *e*- and *i*-class verbs occurs in all 61 forms. The verb lexeme which occurs in most forms is *tener* with 46 different forms. At an average, each verb lexeme (of the e- and the i-class) occurs with 11,5 forms in the corpus. 37 percent of the verbs are above this average, i.e. these lexemes occur with 12 or more forms in the corpus. Among these verb lexemes above the average, there are 16 of the 17 verbs with two or more stems, i.e. with high stem allomorphy.

This means that these highly marked verb lexemes tend to occur in most of the possible paradigmatic forms. Furthermore these verb lexemes occur also in property bundles like future subjunctive that are not lexicalised by most of the other, e.g. regular verb lexemes. The proposed talk explores the following hypothesis: The verb lexemes highly marked by stem allomorphy are best suitable to mark category distinctions and even help to keep category boundaries (or better property bundle boundaries like imperfect or preterite subjunctive) perceivable. Thus, it is just the marked element that transports the morphosyntactic information more conspicuously. Stem allomorphy conveys and strengthens category boundaries.

Since not all possible forms of a verb lexeme occur in probably most discourses, how does a native speaker know these unattested forms and thus the property distinctions? In regular inflected forms it may suffice to assume that this knowledge results from rule application. But in irregular inflected forms there must be a prototype from which other forms can be deduced. This is more or less the idea of Bybee (1980, 1985). In this talk, I will try to find paradigmatic prototypes which serve most economically and / or most exhaustively for the organisation of property distinctions in order to approach the definition of a paradigm.

References

Bybee, Joan L. (1985): *Morphology. A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form*. Benjamins: Amsterdam.

Bybee, Joan L. & Mary A. Brewer (1980): "Explanation in morpho-phonemics: changes in Provençal and Spanish preterite forms", *Lingua* 52: 201-242.

FDSW: Juilland, Alphonse & E. Chang-Rodriguez (1964): *Frequency Dictionary of Spanish Words*. Mouton: The Hague.

Syncretism and suppletion in Gallo-Romance verb paradigms
Marc-Olivier Hinzelin (Keble College, University of Oxford)

Canonically (for a canonical approach to inflectional morphology, cf. Corbett 2007), the lexical material across the cells of a lexeme (i.e. the root or stem) should remain the same and the inflectional material (i.e. the desinences) differ, resulting in a different outcome as inflected form of each paradigm cell. Syncretism and suppletion / stem allomorphy are both non-canonical features of inflectional morphology, violating the above principles by displaying (sometimes completely) different stems of the same lexeme and identical inflectional material in two or more cells.

The explanation of the distribution of suppletive patterns is still an area of much debate: whereas Bybee (1985: 92) states that "suppletive paradigms are divided along the category lines", Maiden (2004: 229) argues, "it is not coherently aligned with any morphosyntactic property [...], but has erratic and idiosyncratic paradigmatic distributions" (e.g. the 'N-pattern', i.e. the 1SG, 2SG, 3SG, 3PL PRES.IND & PRES.SUBJ & 2SG IMP-cells against the remaining cells of the paradigm). In my study, I scrutinise both hypotheses against the backdrop of Gallo-Romance dialects with respect to the verbs that are most affected by suppletion, i.e. 'to go' and 'to be', as well as 'to have' (cf. Veselinova 2006). In Gallo-Romance, the different patterns unearthed by Maiden (which are morphomic in the sense of Aronoff 1994) are often targeted by syncretism.

The Gallo-Romance subgroup shows a large scale of variation with respect to different syncretism patterns and includes those varieties that exhibit the highest degree of syncretism of all Romance languages. A well-known example is the standard French PERSON / NUMBER syncretism in the present tense of the first conjugation where 1SG, 2SG, 3SG, and 3PL are realised by only one single form, e.g. French *parler* 'to speak' (1):

(1) [paʁl] = {1SG PRES.IND}, {2SG PRES.IND}, {3SG PRES.IND}, {3PL PRES.IND}

In suppletive verbs, the distribution of cells to the different stems very often mirrors the syncretic pattern established in regular verbs, e.g. the verb 'to go' in the Lorrain vernacular of Petit-Rombach (2) and Aubure (3) in the North-East of France (Urtel 1902):

(2) [veː] (1SG, 2SG, 3SG), [vã] (1PL, 3PL)   vs   [aˈlɛː] (2PL PRES.IND)

(3) [veː] (1SG, 2SG, 3SG)   vs   [aˈlõ] (1PL, 3PL), [aˈlɛː] (2PL PRES.IND)

These examples show that different suppletive patterns may emerge due to the same syncretic constraints: in (2) the *al*-stem is reduced to the 2PL-cell in the PRES.IND partial paradigm because of 1PL & 3PL-syncretism, whereas in (3) it takes over the 3PL-cell to the detriment of the *v*-stem. But whatever the final outcome, the N-pattern distribution, falls to pieces.

References
Aronoff, Mark (1994): *Morphology by itself. Stems and inflectional classes*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs; 22)
Bybee, Joan L. (1985): *Morphology. A study of the relation between meaning and form.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. (Typological Studies in Language (TSL); 9)
Corbett, Greville G. (2007): "Canonical typology, suppletion, and possible words",

Language 83.1: 8-42.

Maiden, Martin (2004): "When lexemes become allomorphs – On the genesis of suppletion", *Folia Linguistica* 38.3-4: 227-256.

Urtel, Hermann (1902): "Lothringische Studien", *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 26: 670-691.

Veselinova, Ljuba N. (2006): *Suppletion in verb paradigms. Bits and pieces of the puzzle.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. (Typological Studies in Language (TSL); 67)

Syncretism in the marking of Romance object agreement
Michele Loporcaro (Universität Zürich)

This paper is part of a larger research, which aims to pick up the aspects which can be of interest for morphological theory from the empirical domain which is familiar to Romance scholars under the heading «past participle [= PtP] agreement» (in perfective periphrastics). This is no doubt a much-investigated domain, which however has been studied mostly with focus on the syntax rather than on the morphology.

In a previous paper (Loporcaro 2008), I proposed that Romance PtP agreement has to be considered as object agreement, although differing from canonical instances of object agreement familiar from the literature in linguistic typology. I then sketched a tentative inventory of the different kinds of interaction between the syntactic conditions which constrain object agreement and the participial morphology which serves its expression. In doing that, in that context, I did not touch upon syncretism, which is the topic of the present paper.

I will review the different patterns of syncretism documented across Romance in the inflectional paradigm of PtPs. The results of the research include, on the theoretical side, a) a modified definition of (canonical) syncretism (as opposed to neutralization, cf. Baerman et al. 2005), and b) the rejection of the distinction between default and neutral agreement (cf. Corbett 2006).

As for the empirical results of the study, an inventory of occurring syncretisms will be produced, from which some synchronic and diachronic regularities will emerge. The results will also turn out to correspond, rather unexpectedly, to some other morphological regularities (e.g. in the shape of the paradigms of possessive pronouns; cf. Barbato 2008), as well as to some purportedly syntactic phenomena (e.g. loss of agreement with object clitics in Catalan, cf. Wheeler 1988: 194), for which a morphological motivation can be spotted.

References

Baerman, Matthew, Dunstan Brown & Greville G. Corbett (2005): *The Syntax-Morphology Interface. A Study of Syncretism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barbato, Marcello (2008): "Il principio di dissimilazione e il plurale di I classe (con *excursus* sul destino di TUUS SUUS e sull'analogia)". Ms. Bruxelles, ULB.

Corbett, Greville G. (2006): *Agreement.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Loporcaro, Michele (2008): "Variation and change in morphology and syntax. Romance object agreement". Paper given at the 13th International Morphology Meeting, Vienna, February 3-6, 2008.

Wheeler, Max W. (1988a): "Catalan". In: Martin Harris & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *The Romance Languages.* London & Sidney: Croom Helm, 170-208.

Morphomes and 'phonologically conditioned allomorphy'
Martin Maiden (Trinity College, University of Oxford)

It is well known that Romance languages share a verb system characterized by pervasive and idiosyncratic patterns of allomorphy. Most of these have their origins in regular and quite unremarkable phonological changes, and the traditional perspective on them is retrospective: they are viewed, that is, as the predictable outcomes (subject to various analogical modifications) of historical sound change. From a purely synchronic point of view the resultant patterns of allomorphy have an arbitrary paradigmatic distribution.

I have argued in various studies that such arbitrary patterning is not a mere residue of earlier changes, perhaps apparent only to linguists, but a matter of psychologically real, paradigmatic generalizations, which are a major driver of morphological change in the Romance languages. They are morphomes, in the sense of Aronoff (1994), being neither motivated by meaning (their distribution is meaningless), nor by phonology (for their phonological conditioning is extinct).

Some linguists prefer to seek out phonological explanations for such facts wherever possible, and to privilege the phonological over the morphological. Some recent studies (e.g., by Burzio on palatal-velar alternation in Italian verbs, and a forthcoming paper by S. Anderson, on apparent stress conditioning of allomorphy in Romansh) propose that what I believe to be morphomic, patterns in the Romance verb are phonologically conditioned.

My paper will be a discussion of the boundary between the morphomic, and the phonologically conditioned. Through close analysis of data drawn in particular from Romansh, I shall show that the view that they are phonologically, conditioned is often misleading, and the product of an overly phonologizing, perspective on morphology. At the same time, I shall consider some data which really do seem to support phonologizing, accounts. Yet even these, I shall argue, lie squarely within the domain of the autonomously morphological.

The interface of morphology and phonology in the light of accentual patterns in Spanish and Italian verb forms
Judith Meinschaefer (Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg)

Stress assignment in Romance verbs has often been treated as lexical, i.e., as arising from lexically pre-specified stress associated with stems or affixes, rather than assigned by phonological rules (for Spanish cf. e.g. Eddington 2000, Harris 1987, 1989, Roca 1991; for Italian cf. e.g. Mazzola 1996; but see Oltra-Massuet & Arregui 2005 for a rule-based account) – in contrast to stress assignment to nouns, which has been analyzed as rule-based in a number of accounts (e.g. Harris 1995 for Spanish, Jacobs 1994 for Italian). If the location of stress in verb forms really were lexically associated with the stem or with certain affixes, one would expect to find the various patterns of stress assignment distributed in an unconstrained fashion among the cells of the paradigm. Just a short glance at the stress patterns found in verbal paradigms makes it clear, however, that patterns of verb stress depend to a large degree on the morphological structure of the verb forms in question.

That such a relation between morphology and stress assignment exists has been noticed previously (cf. Roca 1999 for Spanish and Romance in general, Pirrelli 2000 for Italian). Rather than merely stipulating, however, that there is an interdependence between morphology and phonology, it would be far more interesting if it could be shown how it derives from some property of the interface between phonology and morphology. This is what the analysis described here attempts at: It proposes to show how the relation between morphological structure and stress assignment may be described by means of constraints relating morphological structure to phonological structure. More specifically, it is proposed that different stress patterns are found in different cells of the paradigms because boundaries of morphological constituents, such as the present stem, the perfect stem and the extended stem, are aligned with boundaries of metrical constituents, i.e., of metrical feet.

The analysis is cast in an optimality theoretic framework. It draws on constraints of the family of generalized alignment constraints (McCarthy & Prince 1993), requiring that a right or left edge of one segment or constituent be aligned with the right or left edge of another segment or constituent. Besides proposing an explanation for the basic descriptive generalization about the location of stress in verb forms, the present analysis can also explain some striking differences between Spanish and Italian, such as the observation that in the singular of some cognate verbs, Italian verbs consistently show proparoxytonic stress, while Spanish verb forms equally consistently present paroxytonic stress. Likewise, it will be shown how the differential constraint ranking proposed for Spanish and Italian derives paroxytonic stress for Italian imperfect forms (except 3rd plural), while in Spanish, some forms have paroxytonic stress and others proparoxytonic stress. Finally, the observations made for Spanish and Italian will be compared to stress assignment in Romanian and Aromunian as well as in Portuguese verb forms.

Morphomes, morphemes, and morphological segmentation
Paul O'Neill (Linacre College, University of Oxford)

In this paper I examine the notion of the morphome as described by Aronoff (1994) and to what extent identity of form is a defining characteristic of the morphome. Works by Maiden tend to assume that the morphome is characterised by the relevant cells in the paradigm all sharing the same root allomorph, e.g. the PYTA-morphome in Spanish. I challenge this view of the morphome and provide evidence principally from Ibero-Romance varieties which suggest that whilst it is essential that the cells of a morphome share certain phonological traits, total identity is not compulsory. I therefore suggest that the morphome is primarily concerned with predicting and restricting allomorphy across the paradigm of a single lexeme and that particular patterns of allomorphy can apply to groups of lexemes.

Once allomorphy is allowed to occur within the morphome, the possibilities of what the morphome can refer to are greatly expanded, I suggest that it could refer to the notion of inflectional class.

The difficulty, however, is determining what exactly ought to be considered as the stem of the verb and what ought to be considered as an affix and a bearer of morphosyntactic features. I give evidence from a number of Romance

varieties which suggest that what morphologists view to be affixes can be viewed by speakers as constituting an allomorph of the root.

Morphology learning as paradigm learning: developmental and computational evidence from Romance languages
Vito Pirrelli (Istituto di Linguistica Computazionale (ILC-CNR), Pisa)

In the classical 'Words and Rules' model (e.g. Pinker & Ullman 2002), learning inflectional morphology is conceptualized as a two-fold process of a) rote memorization of irregulars / sub-regulars and b) rule-based induction from fully regular and productive patterns. From this standpoint, the process of acquiring a perfectly regular sub-paradigm like Italian first conjugation present indicative (first column of Table 1 below) requires awareness of the variety of inflectional marking associated with its paradigm cells and postulation of the rules dealing with that variety. The more the markers, the more the rules to be discovered. As a result of these assumptions, a paradigm showing a greater variety of formal marking should take longer to be acquired. On the other hand, a sub-paradigm showing extensive syncretism (such as the French present indicative, second column of Table 1) should be acquired considerably more quickly.

These predictions have in fact been disconfirmed by the developmental literature. For example, there is considerable evidence that Italian children are more precocious in mastering the present indicative sub-paradigm than English children are in learning the simple contrast between the third singular person and the base form (Pizzuto and Caselli 1993; Hyams 1992). More recently, within the framework of Natural Morphology (Dressler et al. 1987), the development of verb inflection has been investigated cross-linguistically by focusing on the structural properties of morphological paradigms and their role in pacing the acquisition of verb morphology. According to these studies (Bittner et al. 2003, Dressler 2000), verb inflection gradually develops in three steps, going through a pre-morphology and a proto-morphology phase. The turning point between the two phases is marked by an increase in inflectional productivity following the establishment of the first mini-paradigms, i.e. non-isolated mini-sets of (minimally three) phonologically unambiguous and distinct inflected forms of the same verb lemma.

	Italian present indicative	French present indicative	Spanish present indicative
1SG	canto	chante	canto
2SG	canti	chantes	cantas
3SG	canta	chante	canta
1PL	cantiamo	chantons	cantamos
2PL	cantate	chantez	cantáis
3PL	cantano	chantent	cantan

The approach is in line with the constructionist assumption that paradigm development is the result of gradual accumulation and structuring of verb forms to a point where some qualitative changes occur and full morpho-logical competence sets in. More interestingly for our present concerns, the cross-

linguistic investigation of Dressler and colleagues emphasises a striking correlation between stages of inflectional development and typological differences in paradigm structure. In a comprehensive comparison of the developmental stages in the acquisition of inflection in nearly two dozen languages (in the Indo-European, Ugro-Finnic and Semitic families plus Turkish), Bittner et al. (2003) arrive at the conclusion that the transition from lexical processing to morphological patterning is not the automatic outcome of rote lexical storage, but rather the result of an active construction of the child, crucially conditioned by typological factors such as richness, uniformity and transparency of inflectional paradigms.

In the present talk I intend to assess this hypothesis by observing the dynamics of a purely morphological acquisition of Romance verb paradigms through a family of Artificial Neural Networks known as Self-Organizing Maps (Kohonen 2002). I shall show that the interplay between built-in principles of acquisition of time-coded sequences and morphology-specific principles of organization of inflectional paradigms can go a long way in accounting for the typological trends highlighted in Bittner et al. (2003). Reported results allow us to draw some general conclusions concerning the process of morphology acquisition as paradigm-based learning and lead to a reappraisal of the traditional one-route vs. dual-route debate in morphology processing and learning.

Clitics of Italian <u>verbi procomplementari</u>: what are they?
Cinzia Russi (The University of Texas at Austin)

Italian *verbi procomplementari* (De Mauro 1999-2000; henceforth VPR) are characterized by a fully incorporated clitic pronoun (1a-c) or cluster (1d, e) and are "dotati di un proprio significato non riconducibile al verbo principale o molto cristallizzato" (p. xxxiv). VPR, then, stem from a morphosyntactic and semantic diachronic process, whose most apparent manifestations are (a) obligatorification (Lehmann 1985; 1995 [1982]) of the clitic, which is no longer a pronominal complement but has become an inherent component of the verb; and (b) alteration of the original meaning of the verb to different degrees of idiomatization (Russi, in press, a detailed discussion).

(1) a. *voler<u>ne</u>*   'resent ; have hard feelings for somebody' < *volere* 'want' + *ne*
     b. *entrar<u>ci</u>*   'be related to/involved into something' < *entrare* 'enter' + *ci*
     c. *far<u>la</u>* 'deceive; prevail upon somebody cunningly' < *fare* 'make, do' + *la*
     d*. far<u>cela</u>* 'manage' < *fare* 'make, do' + *ci* + *la*
     e. *prender<u>sela</u>* 'take offence, be upset' < *prendere* 'take' + *si* + *la*
     f. *andar<u>sene</u>* 'leave' < *andare* 'go' + *si* + *ne*

My research project aims at drawing attention to this particular verb class, which has not aroused much curiosity thus remaining an under-investigated topic, and to the significance VPR may have for the study of Romance verb classes and verbal morphology (i.e. typology of verbal morphological material). Specifically, VPR raise (at least) the following questions:

(2) a. From a morphosyntactic perspective, should the inherent clitics/clusters of VPR be considered on a par with clitic pronouns?
b. If so, and affixal status is granted to them like to Italian (Romance in general) pronominal clitics (Monachesi 1996, 1999, 2005, *inter al.*), are VPR's clitics inflectional or derivational in nature?
c. What kinds of morphosyntactic and/or semantic-pragmatic features do they carry?
d. Can any behavior typical of these elements or VPR only be identified, which is the result of this dual classification? And has this duality affected their diachronic development?

Data from the sub-class of VPR in *-la* (1c-e) yield evidence showing that a satisfactory integration of inherent clitics into the affix category is difficult to achieve. More precisely, determining whether VPR's clitics are inflectional or derivational and, subsequently, ascertaining to what types of morphosyntactic and/or semantic-pragmatic features they should be related is problematic because they exhibit both features typical of inflectional morphemes and features proper of derivational ones. With inflectional affixes, VPR's clitics share the property of strict obligatoriness (Greenberg 1990 [1954]; Jensen 1990; Matthews 1991, Spencer 1991; Bauer 2003 [1988]). On the other hand, they resemble derivational morphemes in the ability to carry semantic rather than grammatical meaning (e.g. *fare* 'make, do' ~ <u>*rifare*</u> 'remake, redo', <u>*dis*</u>-*fare* 'unmake, undo'; *far<u>la</u>* 'deceive', i.e. 'do something deceitful').

Thus, the differences between standard clitics, which can only function as anaphoric/cataphoric elements or discourse pragmatics markers in dislocated constructions and the inherent, lexicalized clitics of VPR, which in contrast carry semantic and pragmatic content, are not clear-cut and would not be easily captured if we subsume all clitics under a single affixal category.

References

Bauer, Laurie (2003 [1988]): *Introducing Linguistic Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

CORIS/CODIS: [http://corpora.dslo.unibo.it/]

De Mauro, Tullio (1999-2000): *Grande dizionario italiano dell'uso*. Torino: UTET.

Greenberg, Joseph (1990 [1954]): "A quantitative approach to the morphological typology of language", in: *On Language: Selected Writings of Joseph H. Greenberg*, ed. by Keith Denning & Suzanne Kemmer. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 3-25.

Jensen, John T. (1990): *Morphology.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lehmann, Christian (1985): "Grammaticalization: synchronic variation and diachronic change", *Lingua e Stile* 20: 303-318.

Lehmann, Christian (1995 [1982]): *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. München/ Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

Matthews, Peter H. (1991): *Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Monachesi, Paola (1996): *A grammar of Italian clitics*. PhD Dissertation, University of Tilburg.

Monachesi, Paola (1999): *A Lexical Approach to Italian Cliticization* [CLSI Lecture Notes, 84]. Stanford: CLSI Publications.

Monachesi, Paola (2005): *The Verbal Complex in Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Russi, Cinzia (in press): *Italian Clitics. An empirical study* [Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monograph 193]. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Spencer, Andrew (1991): *Morphological Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Et in Acadia ego… – Reflections on person and tense in (mainly Canadian) French

John Charles Smith (St Catherine's College, University of Oxford)

In this paper, I shall examine the distribution of third-person plural forms ending in -*ont* in several varieties of French and attempt to assess their theoretical significance.

In standard French, -*ont* is found in the present indicative in only a handful of frequently occurring verbs: *ils sont* 'they are', *ils ont* 'they have', *ils font* 'they do', *ils vont* 'they go', whether these items function as lexical verbs or as auxiliaries. *Sont* is the only one of these forms where the origin of -*ont* is uncontroversial (Latin SVNT); in the other forms, it must arise from analogy and/or irregular sound change. In addition, -*ont* marks the third-person plural in all synthetic future tense forms, although this fact can be explained straightforwardly by the origin of these forms in a Late Latin periphrasis involving the auxiliary 'have'.

In some varieties of European French, -*ont* was, at an early stage, extended to become the marker of the third-person plural present indicative in verbs of the first conjugation, thus: *ils portont* (as against standard *ils portent*) 'they carry'. Acadian French has inherited this pattern and has extended it to many other verbs besides. At least some of these extensions of -*ont* suggest that -*ont* has, at some stage, been analysed as an ending, with the implication that forms such as, for instance, *sont* have the structure *s+ont*. It is notable that, when extended to certain non-first-conjugation verbs, the -*ont* ending is associated with the stem found in the first and second persons plural, thereby obliterating the characteristic 'N-pattern' morphome (compare *ils pouvont/*ils peuvont* 'they can'). Moreover, these extensions of the -*ont* ending beyond the first conjugation appear to be sensitive to age, sex, and class.

In some other varieties of Canadian French, we find a development affecting the imperfect indicative of the verb *être* 'to be', whereby the third person plural is analogically remodelled on the same person of the present indicative — thus: *ils sontaient* (standard *ils étaient*) 'they were'. In a handful of dialects, a similar remodelling affects the verbs *avoir* 'to have' and *faire* 'to do' — compare *ils ontvaient* (standard *ils avaient*) 'they had', *ils fontsaient* (standard *ils faisaient*) 'they did'. In contrast to the spread of -*ont* discussed above, this development suggests that forms such as *sont*, *ont*, and *font* are being treated as unanalysable.

The data support the view that different varieties may represent the same form in different ways (specifically, that forms such as *sont* may sometimes be represented as a stem plus an ending (*s+ont*) and sometimes as an unanalysable stem (*sont*). In addition, it appears that morphomes may, *inter alia*, be sociolinguistic variables, and that studies of the phenomenon should take account of this fact.

The Romance imperative, irregular morphology, and the morphome

Andrew Swearingen (St Catherine's College, University of Oxford)

Following Aronoff's (1994) examination of and argument for the existence of purely morphological patterns (i.e. 'morphomes') in languages such as English, Hebrew, and Latin, a number of such patterns have been discerned and documented in different Romance languages (Maiden 2001, 2004), specifically in the domain of verb paradigms, which in Romance are particularly rich morphologically.

This paper looks at the Romance imperative, its relation to the rest of the paradigm, and the apparent absence of morphomic patterns that include it. In contrast to Latin, Romance imperative morphology shows widespread syncretism with present, generally indicative verb forms. Depending on variety and conjugation class, two cells which demonstrate overwhelming syncretism are the 2sg imperative with the 3sg present indicative, e.g. Occitan 2sg *dorm* 'sleep' = 3sg *dorm*. The syncretic relationship between these two cells of the paradigm, in which a semantic explanation is not plausible, would seem to constitute an ideal locus for the manifestation of a morphomic pattern. Nevertheless, a cursory perusal of Romance data reveals, with one possible counter-example, that such manifestations are conspicuously absent, both synchronically and diachronically. When processes leading to morphological irregularity occur in one form, irrespective of the degree or type of differentiation, they do not affect the other form, as will be illustrated by a number of examples from across Romance.

This raises the question of what kind of conditions are necessary for the establishment of morphomic patterns in the first place. I shall consider whether the lack of morphomic patterns between 2sg imperative and 3sg present indicative forms is due to a lack of necessary preconditions for 'morphomogenesis', such as the lack of a larger set of paradigmatic cells of which these are simply two components, thus favouring the creation of a morphomic relationship, or alternatively, if it is simply due to a peculiarity of the imperative itself, such as its peripheral status to the rest of the paradigm. I will also address a potential counter-example, i.e. the possible existence of a morphome between the 2sg imperative and 3sg present indicative in medieval Catalan, arguing that if it does indeed represent an example, it still represents an extremely rare one, serving as an exception to what appears to be a rather solid rule.

Periphrasis in Romance verbs
Catherine Taylor (University of Essex, Colchester)

Periphrasis is often considered the domain of syntax; however, it has been argued (by, for example, Sadler & Spencer 2001, Spencer 2001, Ackerman & Stump 2003) that it is actually morphology. The Catalan preterite tense has both synthetic and analytic forms; *arribaren*, *van arribar* `they arrived'; with no semantic difference:

(1) S'acostà a la porta i va trucar-hi dos cops.
     ≡ Es va acostar a la porta i hi trucà dos cops.
     'He went up to the door and knocked twice.'
     (Wheeler, Yates & Dols 1999: 343)

That a synthetic form exists arguably puts the preterite in morphology; a rule preventing the analytic form being realised morphologically would be contrived. Furthermore, Ackerman & Stump (2003) say that if the set of morphosyntactic features of a construction is not the sum of its parts, the expression is periphrastic. This is commonly the case in Romance, as *van arribar* shows, where the auxiliary is in the present tense, but the expression as a whole is past tense.

Paradigm Function Morphology (PFM; Stump 2001) is an inferential-realisational theory of morphology that maps a root X and a complete set σ of morphosyntactic properties onto the cell in the lexeme's paradigm that realises those properties. Analyses based on PFM (such as Sadler & Spencer 2001, Spencer 2001, and Stump 2002) suggest that a set of syntactic properties map onto a set of morphosyntactic properties. Most recently, (Otoguro 2008) claims that the components of periphrases are selected by instantiation of the PF with the *syntactic* set to obtain the uninflected constituents; these constituents form the input to another instantiation of the PF with the corresponding *morphosyntactic* properties, giving the inflected periphrase. This approach effectively forces the morphology to perform syntax: this is as unsatisfactory as having the syntax perform morphology (as exemplified by Aronoff 1994).

I propose a solution using Generalised Paradigm Function Morphology (GPFM; Spencer 2004), retaining the distinction between syntax and morphology. In GPFM, lexemes are defined by indexed lexical entries, describing the form, syntax and semantics. A pairing of a lexeme and a complete set s of morphosyntactic properties is the Generalised PF's input; the output is an inflected word form w: GPF(<L,σ>) = w. The GPF is defined by four subfunctions; here the three relevant subfunctions are: HOST, the form that affixes are attached to; EXPONENCE, the inflectional affixes; and LINEARISATION, the order in which the exponents are placed with respect to the host. For the Catalan preterite above, σ = {3pl preterite indicative}, evaluation of the GPF for the synthetic case gives: HOST = *arribare* (Spencer & Taylor 2007 explains how stems are identified), EXPONENCE = n. The linearisation function specifies suffixation by default for Catalan, giving *arribaren*, as expected. In the analytic case, the GPF is referred to two functions: one that evaluates the auxiliary ANAR with σ = {3pl present indicative} and one that evaluates ARRIBAR with σ = {infinitive}. The output from each of these functions is concatenated appropriately to give the inflected periphrase. The syntax does not need to

know whether a construction is synthetic or periphrastic, and the two domains are discrete.

References

Ackerman, Farrel & Gregory Stump (2003): "Paradigms and periphrastic expression: a study in realization-based lexicalism", in: Sadler & Spencer, 111-157.

Aronoff, Mark (1994): *Morphology by itself. Stems and inflectional classes*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs; 22)

Otoguro, Ryo (2008): "Multiple paradigmatic structure and lexemic relations" Paper read at the 5th York-Essex Morphology Meeting.

Sadler, Louisa & Andrew Spencer (2001): "Syntax as an exponent of morphological features", in: *Yearbook of Morphology 2000*, ed. by Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 71-96.

Sadler, Louisa & Andrew Spencer (eds) (2003): *Projecting morphology*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Spencer, Andrew (2001): "The paradigm-based model of morphosyntax", *Transactions of the Philological Society* 99.2: 279-313.

Spencer, Andrew (2004): "Generalized Paradigm Functional Morphology" Manuscript, University of Essex Website.
[http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/ ~spena/papers/GPFM.pdf accessed March 2005]

Spencer, Andrew & Catherine Taylor (2007): "Maximising stems". Talk given at the 6th Mediterranean Morphology Meeting.

Stump, Gregory T. (2001): *Inflectional morphology: a theory of paradigm structure*. Cambridge: CUP. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics; 93)

Stump, Gregory T. (2002): "Morphological and syntactic paradigms: arguments for a theory of paradigm linkage", in: *Yearbook of Morphology 2001*, ed. by Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 147-180.

Wheeler, Max W., Alan Yates & Nicolau Dols (1999): *Catalan: a comprehensive grammar.* London: Routledge. (Routledge Grammars)

A non-canonical phenomenon in Italian verb morphology: double forms realizing the same cell

Anna M. Thornton (Università dell'Aquila)

In the canonical approach to morphological description (Corbett 2005, 2007a, 2007b), a canonical paradigm is expected to exhibit COMPLETENESS, i.e., "for any given lexeme, every cell of its paradigm will be filled by the inflectional system" (Corbett 2005:33). A further expectation, not (yet) named by Corbett, could be called UNIQUENESS OF REALIZATION, and stated in the following way: "for any given lexeme, every cell of its paradigm will be filled in a unique way". Deviations from this canonical situation are represented by cases in which a cell is filled by two synonymous forms which realize the same set of morphosyntactic properties. With respect to the properties of canonical inflection (Corbett 2007a: 9), double forms can represent deviations of different kinds. Table 1 shows cases of deviations from uniqueness of realization of cells, exemplifying from Italian verb morphology.

Table 1. Deviations from uniqueness of realization of cells in Italian verb morphology

	Deviations instantiated by double forms in the same cell of the same lexeme	Examples
COMPOSITION/ STRUCTURE	forms following two different conjugations in the same cell	*eseguo / eseguisco* 'perform:1.PRS.IND'
LEXICAL MATERIAL (≈ shape of stem)	forms built on two different stems in the same cell	*devo / debbo* 'must:1.PRS.IND' *vado / vo, faccio / fo* 'go:1. PRS.IND', 'do:1. PRS.IND' *doliamo / dogliamo* 'suffer:1PL.PRS.IND' *giacciamo / giaciamo* 'lie_down:1PL.PRS.IND' *parvi / parsi* 'seem:1.PRF.IND' *sederò / siederò* 'sit:1.FUT' *morrò / morirò* 'die:1.FUT' *udirò / udrò* 'hear:1.FUT' *visto / veduto (?)* 'see:PST.PTCP'
INFLECTIONAL MATERIAL (≈shape of inflection)	forms with two different inflectional endings in the same cell	*temei / temetti (?)* 'fear:1.PRF.IND' *va' / vai, fa' / fai, sta' / stai* 'go:2.IMP', 'do:2.IMP', 'stay:2.IMP' *udente / udiente* 'hear:PRS.PTCP'

As the examples in Table 1 show, double forms can be claimed to represent deviations from canonicity in all areas, but doubling due to the employment of two different stems seems prevalent in Italian. The classification of some examples depends on the analysis: is *temei / temetti* an instance of different inflectional endings realizing the same cell (analysis: *teme-i / teme-tti*) or an instance of two different stems employed in the same cell (analysis: *teme-i / temett-i*)? If the first analysis is chosen, some double forms can be classified as representing a double deviation from canonicity, exhibiting both two different stems and two different endings in the same cell (*died-i / de-tti, bevv-i / beve-i // beve-tti*). A question to be answered is whether all double forms can be analyzed in such a way that they can be reduced to a single kind of deviation.

The poster presentation will aim at a description of the areas in which double forms occur in Italian verb inflection. The relations between double forms and other kinds of deviations from canonicity, such as heteroclisis, suppletion, and morphomic stem alternation, will be addressed. The relative strength of different kinds of double forms will be assessed through a corpus-based study of their frequency of occurrence in contemporary Italian.

References
Corbett, Greville G. (2005): "The canonical approach in typology", in: *Linguistic Diversity and Language Theories*, ed. by Zygmunt Frajzyngier, Adam Hodges, David S. Rood. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, 25-49.
Corbett, Greville G. (2007a): "Canonical typology, suppletion, and possible words", *Language* 83.1: 8-41.
Corbett, Greville G. (2007b): "Deponency, Syncretism, and What Lies Between", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 145: 21-43.

Reanalysis of final consonants in French verb + pronoun sequences

Jesse Tseng (CNRS & CLLE-ERSS, Université de Toulouse 2 - Le Mirail)

Final consonants whose realization is conditioned by external sandhi constraints (e.g. English *a* vs *an*) can be reanalyzed as the initial consonant of the following word (e.g. English *an ekename > a nickname*). The historical development of final consonants in French, which gave rise to the phenomenon of consonantal liaison characteristic of modern French, resulted in a number of systematic reanalyses of this type. We examine the evolution of final *t* in 3rd person verb forms and final *s* in imperatives, and the interaction with the grammaticalization of verb + pronoun combinations.

All 3rd person forms in Latin ended in *t*. In forms where this consonant was preceded by a simple vowel (after the reduction/deletion of vowels in unstressed final syllables in the 7th century), final *t* disappeared completely by the 12th century. In other forms, *t* was protected from deletion by contact with another consonant or an off-glide. This *t* was progressively lost, along with most other final consonants, between the 13th and 16th centuries. With a few exceptions (e.g. some simple past tense forms), modern orthography reflects the evolution of these two groups of verbs: *porte* (Lat. PORTAT > 7th c. *portet* > 11th c. *porte*) vs. *dort* (Lat. DORMIT > 7th c. *dor(m)t* > 13th c. *dor(t)*). By the Middle French period (14th-16th centuries), final orthographic *t* was only pronounced in liaison contexts, when followed by a vowel-initial word.

In particular, when the next word was a 3rd person subject pronoun (*il(s), elle(s), on*), final *t* was systematically pronounced, reinforcing the cohesion of the combination and contributing to the grammaticalization of the pronominal inversion structure: *dort-elle*. The reanalysis of final *t* of the verb as the initial consonant of a special allomorph of the pronoun in inversion contexts led to the reintroduction of *t* with vowel-final verbs beginning in the 15th century: *porte-t-elle, alla-t-on*. The realization of this *t* in modern French is commonly treated as a case of obligatory liaison, but the same verb forms in other contexts do not allow liaison with *t* (*porte, alla, dort*), or they allow it only optionally in formal styles (e.g. imperfects in *-ait*, plural forms in *-nt*). Instead, it should be recognized that, by the process of univerbation, sequences of "verb + inverted subject pronoun" no longer involve an ordinary word boundary. The *t* could be synchronically associated with a specially marked inversion form of the verb, but we prefer to treat it as part of the pronoun, or as a linking morpheme associated with the grammaticalized structure as a whole.

The final *s* in French imperative forms presents a similar case. In the 2nd person singular, final *s* does not go back to a Latin verb ending, but was introduced from the 13th century onwards, by analogy with present indicative forms, first for *-ir/-re* verbs (*boif > boi > bois*), and subsequently for *-er* verbs (*chante > chantes*). This *s* was only pronounced in liaison contexts, where it was pronounced as [z]. Nowadays this consonant is only realized in grammaticalized positive imperative structures where the verb is followed by the enclitic *y* or *en*: *va au marché* vs *vas-y*. This systematic cooccurrence has led to the reanalysis of [z] as the initial consonant of the post-verbal allomorphs *zy* and *zen* which appear in spoken French, even when separated from the verb by another enclitic: $^{\%}$*donne-moi-zen,* $^{\%}$*mets-le-zy*.

Although the linking consonants in these verb + pronoun structures derive from verb endings, they are no longer part of the system of verbal inflection in modern French.

References
Fouché, P. (1967): *Étude morphologique du verbe français*. Paris: Klincksieck.
Zink, G. (1986): *Phonétique historique du français*. 6th ed. Paris: PUF.

Non-finite forms and the paradigm in Latin and (Italo–)Romance
Nigel Vincent (University of Manchester)

The paper investigates a series of case-studies whose common empirical content is that they all involve Latin or Romance (and mainly Italo-Romance) non-finite forms – in traditional terminology gerunds, infinitives, participles – and whose shared theoretical purpose is to argue for what Stump (2001: 1-3) calls an 'inferential-realizational' approach to morphology and against the 'lexical-realizational' approach offered by Distributed Morphology (DM) [cf. Embick & Halle 2005 for Latin and in the Romance context Pomino & Remberger 2007].

Non-finite forms are of interest in a number of respects. First, they raise the issue of the limits of the paradigm: are all, some or none of these forms to be considered part of the paradigm and on what grounds, and what do we thereby learn about the nature of the morphology-syntax interface (Stump 2007)? Second, there is the question of their categorial status and the links between verbal, nominal and adjectival morphology. We are thus forced to ask about the nature of the shared theoretical vocabulary between morphology and syntax in different models (Halle & Embick 2005). Third, from a diachronic perspective they raise the question of the way the limits of the paradigm can change over time. Fourth, beyond the particularities of individual theories, they raise the general issue of how to establish the interface, both synchronically and diachronically, between 'pure' morphology in the sense of Aronoff (1994) and the considerable body of evidence from grammaticalization studies that morphological forms may arise from patterns which are in origin semantically motivated. Non-finite forms have a crucial role since it is precisely via combinations of various non-finite forms with delexicalised main verbs (aka 'auxiliaries') that new morphological exponents often come into existence.

Our case-studies include:

a) The Latin gerund(ive) and its relation to the Romance gerund: Maiden (1996) emphasises the apparently arbitrary patterns that may be generalised in the morphology of gerund but the role of the various gerund-based periphrases on the one hand and the syntax of the gerund as an independent form on the other require to be integrated into the story.

b) The compound gerund, e.g. Italian *avendo scritto*, which has no direct Latin etymon but is a Romance formation motivated within the periphrastic part of the paradigm.

c) The Latin participle in *-urus*: this formation is a staple of the pure morphology literature but the means by which it comes into existence (Postgate 1894) offer an instructive instance of the transition from periphrastic to pure morphology. We show how its disappearance from Romance follows from developments elsewhere in the periphrastic part of the system, and *en passant* argue against the synchronic account of this formation in Halle & Embick (2005).

25

References
Aronoff, Mark (1994): *Morphology by itself*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Embick, David & Morris Halle (2005): "On the status of stems in morphological theory". In T. Geerts and H. Jacobs eds. *Proceedings of Going Romance 2003*.
Maiden, Martin (1996): "The Romance gerund and 'system-dependent naturalness' in morphology". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 94: 167-201.
Pomino, Natascha & Eva-Maria Remberger (2007): "Distributed morphology and minimalist syntax of Spanish *ir*". Unpublished MS, University of Konstanz.
Postgate, J. P. (1894): "The future infinitive active in Latin". *IF* 4: 252-258.
Ramchand, Gillian & Charles Reiss (eds) (2007): *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces*. Oxford: OUP.
Stump, Gregory (2001): *Inflectional morphology*. Cambridge: CUP.
Stump, Gregory (2007): "Paradigm-function morphology and the morphology-syntax interface". In Ramchand & Reiss, 383-421.

The evolution of a morphome in Catalan verb inflection, with evidence from a medieval corpus

Max W. Wheeler (University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton)

Catalan inflectional verb morphology displays a curious and complex morphome. The full set of categories involved includes (a) and (b):
(a)   1st singular present indicative
                Present subjunctive
(b)   Past perfective indicative (synthetic)
                Past subjunctive
                Past participle
In many varieties the morphome extends to the gerund and the infinitive too. The morphome is generally marked by a velar consonant: /k/ after a sibilant, /g/ elsewhere. In the Barcelona standard variety, only forms from the 2nd (-*e*-) conjugation are involved, and not all verbs display the morphome effect – stems ending in obstruents are excluded. In other varieties (e.g. Valencian), the pattern is found in the 3rd (-*i*-) conjugation also, and more widely in the 2nd conjugation as well. In all varieties, though, the pattern is displayed by verbs which are among the most frequent, such as: *conèixer* 'know', *dir* 'say', *estar* 'be', *poder* 'can', *prendre* 'take', *tenir* 'have', *venir* 'come', *voler* 'will'.
In this paper I explore the evolution of this morphome, especially in the period 1200-1600, using corpus data from the *Corpus Informatitzat del Català Antic (CICA)*. A full account would involve data from Occitan also, since this language shares the essentials of the morphome, but for space reasons only Catalan is covered in this paper. The morphome contains two sub-parts, (a) and (b) above, originally in different verbs, though in both submorphomes the marker was originally a root-final velar retained as such before original back-vowel suffixes, being subject to palatalization and later shifts in original front-vowel suffix contexts, the complement of the categories mentioned above. The submorphome (a) marked by a final velar is found rather more widely in Romance (e.g. Spanish. Italian), where too it has spread beyond the verbs originally justifying its presence. The submorphome (b) can be traced back to regular sound alternations in verbs with a Latin "perfective" stem in -CU- , such as IACUIT > Old Cat. *jag* 'lay', PLACUIT > Old Cat. *plag* 'pleased'. Some scholars claim that sound change accounts for the presence of velars more widely, such

as POTUIT > *pog* 'could' and TENUIT > *teng* 'had'. I argue, however, that the latter forms are analogical, as the so-called sound change is not attested outside the verb forms in question. All the two submorphomes originally had in common was a /g/ which was absent in the extra-morphomic categories. The spread in individual verbs of the velar marker from submorphome (a) to submorphome (b) or from (b) to (a), and from the original verbs to others, can, in part, be traced in the medieval corpus, though texts in Catalan are unfortunately not early enough to track the full acquisition of both submorphomes by verbs such as *tenir* 'have' and *venir* 'come' that cannot originally have had either. I attempt to identify the morphological, phonological, and possibly semantic, motivations for the observed spread. Some more modern developments involving "velarization" of categories outside (a) and (b) may reflect a tendency to give the morphome marker greater semantic motivation, such as by having it characterize marked inflectional categories in general.

FIRST OXFORD WORKSHOP ON ROMANCE VERB MORPHOLOGY – OXMORPH1
27-Aug-2008 – 28-Aug-2008 at Trinity College, Oxford, UK

List of Participants

Name	University	e-mail
Montserrat Adam-Aulinas	Universitat de Barcelona	adam [at] ub.edu
Stephen R. Anderson	Yale University, New Haven, CT	sra [at] yale.edu
Mark Aronoff	Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY	maronoff [at] notes.cc.sunysb.edu
Chiara Cappellaro	Exeter College, University of Oxford	chiara.cappellaro [at] exeter.ox.ac.uk
Angelo Costanzo	The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH	costanzo.25 [at] osu.edu
Sascha Gaglia	Universität Konstanz	sascha.gaglia [at] uni-konstanz.de
Maria Goldbach	University of Oxford	maria.goldbach [at] mod-langs.ox.ac.uk
Pius ten Hacken	Swansea University	p.ten-hacken [at] swan.ac.uk
Marc-Olivier Hinzelin	Keble College, University of Oxford	marc-olivier.hinzelin [at] mod-langs.ox.ac.uk
Steven Kaye	Magdalen College, University of Oxford	steven.kaye [at] ling-phil.ox.ac.uk
Aditi Lahiri	Somerville College, University of Oxford	aditi.lahiri [at] ling-phil.ox.ac.uk
Michele Loporcaro	Universität Zürich	loporcar [at] rom.uzh.ch
Martin Maiden	Trinity College, University of Oxford	martin.maiden [at] mod-langs.ox.ac.uk
Judith Meinschaefer	Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg	judith.meinschaefer [at] uni-wuerzburg.de
Paul O'Neill	Linacre College, University of Oxford	paul.oneill [at] linacre.ox.ac.uk
Vito Pirrelli	Istituto di Linguistica Computazionale, Pisa	vito.pirrelli [at] ilc.cnr.it
Eva-Maria Remberger	Clare Hall, University of Cambridge / Universität Konstanz	eva.remberger [at] uni-konstanz.de
Cinzia Russi	The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX	russi [at] mail.utexas.edu
Ora R. Schwarzwald	Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan	oschwarz [at] mail.biu.ac.il
John Charles Smith	St Catherine's College, University of Oxford	johncharles.smith [at] stcatz.ox.ac.uk
Alexandra Stavinschi	Christ Church, University of Oxford	alexandra.stavinschi [at] mod-langs.ox.ac.uk
Andrew Swearingen	St Catherine's College, University of Oxford	andrew.swearingen [at] mod-langs.ox.ac.uk
Catherine Taylor	University of Essex, Colchester	ctaylob [at] essex.ac.uk
Ros Temple	New College, University of Oxford	rosalind.temple [at] new.ox.ac.uk
Anna M. Thornton	Università dell'Aquila	thornton [at] cc.univaq.it
Jesse Tseng	Université de Toulouse 2 - Le Mirail	jesse.tseng [at] univ-tlse2.fr
Nigel Vincent	University of Manchester	nigel.vincent [at] manchester.ac.uk
Max W. Wheeler	University of Sussex, Brighton	m.w.wheeler [at] sussex.ac.uk
Zheng Xu	National University of Singapore	chsxz [at] nus.edu.sg

Meeting Email: oxmorph [at] mod-langs.ox.ac.uk
Website: http://www.mod-langs.ox.ac.uk/romance-morphology/workshops/oxmorph1.html

Oxford Colleges

1 All Souls (Research)
2 Balliol
3 Blackfriars*
4 Brasenose
5 Campion Hall*
6 Christ Church
7 Corpus Christi
8 Exeter
9 Green College**
10 Greyfriars* (direction)
11 Harris Manchester
12 Hertford
13 Jesus
14 Keble
15 Kellogg**
16 Lady Margaret Hall
17 Linacre**
18 Lincoln
19 Magdalen
20 Mansfield
21 Merton
22 New
23 Nuffield**
24 Oriel
25 Pembroke
26 Queen's
27 Regent's Park*
28 St Anne's
29 St Antony's**
30 St Benet's Hall*
31 St Catherine's
32 St Cross**
33 St Edmund Hall
34 St Hilda's
35 St Hugh's
36 St John's
37 St Peter's
38 St Stephen's House*
   (direction)
39 Somerville
40 Templeton** /
   Egrove Park
41 Trinity
42 University
43 Wadham
44 Wolfson**
45 Worcester
46 Wycliffe Hall*
*   Permanent Private Hall
** Graduate College
i   Undergraduate
    Admissions

University of Oxford
Colleges and Halls

© 2007 University of Oxford, Public Affairs Directorate

Al-Shami

St-Catz

Taylorian

Trinity   Kings Arms

Cricket Ground

UNIVERSITY PARKS

RIVER

CHERWELL

Sports Ground

Playing Fields

Tennis Courts

Tennis

Playing Field

Bus Station

Rail Station

Magdalen Grove

OLD CITY WALL

Deer Park

Botanic Garden

Angel and Greyhound Meadow

Merton Field

Playing Field

Christ Church Meadow

Recreation Ground

College of Further Education

Westgate Shopping Centre

MOUND CASTLE

BONN SQ.

Brewer Street

Park End Street

Bonley Road

RIVER

MILL STREAM

THAMES OR ISIS

Folly Bridge

To Headington

Iffley Road Sports Complex