Morphology is the area of linguistics which studies the structure of words.

Almost all natural language applications require some processing of words: lexicon lookup, morphological analysis and generation, part-of-speech determination etc.

In order to implement such functions, it is necessary to understand which morphological processes take place in a variety of languages. Why look at many languages?

# הם דיברו כל הלילה

Observations:

- דיברו is third person, plural, past form of the verb דיברו
- this form is obtained by concatenating the suffix 1 to the base ריבר
- in the inflected form [dibru], the vowel [e] of the base [diber] is reduced to a schwa. This reduction is mandatory, as [diberu] is ungrammatical.

These simple observations shed light on a variety of issues:

- What information is encoded by morphology? In the example, morphology encodes details such as person, number and tense.
- How does morphology encode information?
   In the example, the final form is obtained by concatenating an affix (which is not a word) to the end of a base (which might be a word).
- Interaction of morphology and phonology In the example, the vowel [e] is shortened to a schwa.

# Structure of this part of the course

- Parts of speech
- Typology of languages
- Inflection and derivation
- What information is encoded by morphology
- How morphology encodes information
  - concatenation, infixation, circumfixation, root and pattern, reduplication
- Interaction of morphology and phonology

## Parts of speech

- Words are traditionally classified into *categories*, known as *parts of speech* or *word classes*.
- The major parts of speech are *noun*, *verb*, *adjective*, *adverb*, *pronoun*, *proper name*, *preposition*, *conjunction*, *article* etc.
- Subcategorization
- Open classes and closed classes
- Content words vs. function words
- Parts of speech can shed light on the context in which a word can occur, its neighbors and even its pronunciation: *complex*
- The problematic nature of this classification
- POS tagging

Isolating : no bound forms. Example: Mandarin Chinese Agglutinative : bound forms occur and are arranged in the word like beads on a string. Example: Turkish

Polysynthetic : elements that often occur as separate words in other languages (such as arguments of the verb) are expressed morphologically. Example: Yupik (central Alaska)

Inflectional : distinct features are merged into a single bound form. Example: Latin

No bound forms. Example: Mandarin Chinese

Example							
0				qīngcài vegetable			

Can mean any of the following (inter alia):

- the dog doesn't like to eat vegetables
- the dog didn't like to eat vegetables
- the dogs don't like to eat vegetables
- the dogs didn't like to eat vegetables
- dogs don't like to eat vegetables

# Beads on a string. Example: Turkish çöplüklerimizdekiledenmiydi

Example										
çöp	lük	ler	imiz	de	ki	ler	den	mi	у	di
trash	Aff	ΡI	1 p/Pl	Loc	Rel	ΡI	Abl	Int	Aux	Past
"was it	"was it from those that were in our garbage cans?"									

המשבפחי ו?

Morphology encodes units that are usually considered syntactic (as in noun incorporation). Example: Yupik qayá:liy'u:l'u:n'i

Example								
qayá:	li	y'u:	l'u:	n'i				
kayaks	make	excellent	he	Past				
"he was excellent at making kayaks"								

"The grammar is in the morphology"

Portmanteau morphemes: a single morpheme can encode various bits of information. Example: Latin amó

Example								
am	ó							
love	1p/Sg/Pres/Indicative/Active							
"I love	9"							

*Inflectional* morphology takes as input a word and outputs a form of the same word appropriate to a particular context.

Example:  $[dibber] \Rightarrow [dibbru]$ 

The output is appropriate to a context in which the subject is third person plural and the tense is past.

Hence: words have *paradigms*, defining all possible inflected forms of a word. Words which belong to the same paradigm are all *inflected forms* of a single *lexeme*.

Derivational morphology takes as input a word and outputs a different word that is derived from the input. This is also called *word formation*.

Example: establish+ment+ary+an+ism Example: החלשיות  $\rightarrow$  החלשי החליט  $\rightarrow$ 

## Inflections and derivations: distinctive criteria

- Inflection does not change the part-of-speech, derivation might. החלטי-החלטה; החלטה
- Inflection is sometimes required by the syntax, derivation never is.
- If a language marks an inflectional category, it marks it on all appropriate words. In other words, the relation denoted by inflectional morphology is *productive*.

Verbs specify the number (and type) of arguments they may take. In many languages, morphological devices modify these lexically specified markings.

Example: passivization (Latin)

Examp	le	
puer boy " <mark>the b</mark>	Cicerōnem Cicero oy praises Cice	praise/3/Sg/Pres/Ind/ <b>Act</b>
"Cicer	Cicerōnem Cicero o is praised"	laudātur praise/3/Sg/Pres/Ind/ <b>Pass</b>

#### Example: causativization

Example	
הוציא → יצא ;האכיל → אכל	

Verbs are commonly marked with indications of the time at which the situations denoted by them occurred, or the state of completion of the situation. Such markers encode *tense* and *aspect*, respectively.

Example: Latin

Examp	le								
man	Cicerōnem Cicero nan will praise	praise/3/Sg/ <b>Future</b> /Ind							
man	vir Cicerōnem laudāvit								

In many languages the verb must *agree* on person, number, gender or other features with one or more of its arguments. Example:

Example	Example									
The *The	princess princess			frog frog						
הם הם*	דברו דברה	כל כל	הלילה הלילה							

In some languages (e.g., Georgian and Chicheŵa) verbs agree not only with their subjects but also with their objects.

Inflectional categories for nouns (and adjectives) include

- number (singular, plural, dual)
- case (marking various kinds of semantic function)
- gender (feminine, masculine, neuter)

Latin has five cases: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, ablative.

Finnish has fourteen different cases!

Example: the inflection paradigm of the noun *magnus* (big) in Latin.

#### Example

		masculine	feminine	neuter
sing.	nom	magn+ <b>us</b>	magn+ <b>a</b>	magn+ <b>um</b>
	gen	magn+ <b>ī</b>	magn+ <b>ae</b>	magn+ <b>ī</b>
	dat	magn+ <b>ō</b>	magn+ <b>ae</b>	magn+ <b>ō</b>
	acc	magn+ <b>um</b>	magn+ <b>am</b>	magn+ <b>um</b>
	abl	magn $+oldsymbol{ar{o}}$	magn+ <b>ā</b>	magn $+oldsymbol{ar{o}}$
plur.	nom	magn+ <b>ī</b>	magn+ <b>ae</b>	magn+ <b>a</b>
	gen	magn+ <b>ōrum</b>	magn+ <b>ārum</b>	magn+ <b>ōrum</b>
	dat	magn+ <b>īs</b>	magn+ <b>īs</b>	magn+ <b>īs</b>
	acc	magn+ <b>ōs</b>	magn+ <b>ās</b>	magn+ <b>a</b>
	abl	magn+ <b>īs</b>	magn+ <b>īs</b>	magn+ <b>īs</b>

Many languages distinguish between two or three grammatical genders: feminine, masculine and neuter.

In some languages, such as the Bantu languages, more detailed gender classes exist.

Example: Swahili has inflection affixes for humans, thin objects, paired things, instruments and extended body parts, inter alia.

Many languages express comparison of adjectives morphologically. Example: Welsh

Example	9		
gwyn	gwynn+ <b>ed</b>	gwynn+ <b>ach</b>	gwynn+ <b>af</b>
white	as white	whiter	whitest
teg	tec+ <b>ed</b>	tec+ <b>ach</b>	tec+ <b>af</b>
fair	as fair	fairer	fairest

In general, derivational morphology is not as productive as inflectional morphology.

Nominalization: destroy  $\rightarrow$  destruction; שמירה  $\rightarrow$  שמר; שמירה  $\rightarrow$  הסכים; פיתוח הסכם  $\rightarrow$ 

Denominalized adjectives: מציאותי → מציאותי

Adjective nominalization: grammatical  $\rightarrow$  grammaticality; של  $\rightarrow$  של חות

Negation: able  $\rightarrow$  unable; אלחושי  $\rightarrow$  חושי

In contrast to derivations and inflections, where affixes are attached to a stem, in compounding two or more lexemes' stems are joint together, forming another lexeme. Example: policeman; newspaper; יפת עיי ים ;עורך דין Both lexemes might undergo modification in the process. In German, the concatenation is expressed in the orthography:

#### Example

#### ${\it lebens versicher ung sgesellschaft sangestellter}$

leben	s	versicherung	s	gesellschaft	s	angestellter
life		insurance		company		employee

In order to know what morphemes are, it is useful to check in what ways they are expressed.

The simplest model of morphology is the situation where a morphologically complex word can be analyzed as a series of morphemes concatenated together.

An example: Turkish. Not only is Turkish morphology exclusively concatenative; in addition, all affixes are suffixes. Turkish words are of the form *stem suffix*<sup>\*</sup>.

Example										
çöp	lük	ler	imiz	de	ki	ler	den	mi	у	di
trash	Aff	ΡI	1 p/Pl	Loc	Rel	ΡI	Abl	Int	Aux	Past
"was it from those that were in our garbage cans?"										

Linear concatenation is not the only way in which languages put morphemes together. Affixes may also attach as *infixes* inside words.

Example: Bontoc (Philippines)

Example		
fikas strong	$\rightarrow$	f- <b>um</b> +ikas be strong
kilad red	$\rightarrow$	k- <b>um</b> +ilad be red
fusul enemy	$\rightarrow$	f- <b>um</b> +usul be an enemy

In the Bontoc case the infix must be placed after the first consonant of the word to which it attaches.

In general, the placement of infixes is governed by prosodic principles.

Example: Ulwa (Nicaragua)

Example	
suu+ <b>ki</b> -lu	my dog
suu+ <b>ma</b> -lu	your (Sg) dog
suu+ <b>ka</b> -lu	his/her/its dog
suu+ <b>ni</b> -lu	our (inclusive) dog
suu+ <b>ki+na</b> -lu	our (exclusive) dog
suu+ <b>ma+na</b> -lu	your (PI) dog
suu+ <b>ka+na</b> -lu	their dog

Some languages exhibit *circumfixes*, affixes which attach discontinuously around a stem.

Example: German participles

Example	
brüsten	ge+säusel+t ge+brüst+et ge+täusch+t

In contrast to processes of attaching an affix to a stem, there exist also nonsegmental morphological processes. A typical example is the Semitic *root and pattern* morphology. Example: Hebrew *binyanim* 

#### Example

\_a\_a\_, ni\_\_a\_, \_i\_\_el, \_u\_\_a\_, hi\_\_i\_, hu\_\_a\_, hit\_a\_\_e\_.

Another nonsegmental process is *reduplication*. Example: Indonesian

Example					
orang $\rightarrow$	orang+orang				
man	men				

Sometimes only part of the word is duplicated, as in Yidin (Australia) plural:

Example		
mulari	$\rightarrow$	mula+mulari
man aindalba		men
gindalba lizard	$\rightarrow$	gindal+gindalba lizards

In its most general definition, a morpheme is an ordered pair  $\langle {\rm CAT}, {\rm PHON} \rangle$ , where  ${\rm CAT}$  is the morphological category expressed by the morpheme (for example, its syntactic and semantic features), and PHON represents its phonological form, including the ways in which it is attached to its stem.

#### Example

A morpheme is a pairing of syntactic/semantic information with phonological information. In the same way, it is useful to assume that words have dual structures: phonological and morphological. The two structures are not always isomorphic.

It is a fairly traditional observation in morphology that there are really two kinds of words from a structural point of view: phonological words and syntactic words. These two notions specify overlapping but not identical sets of entities. furthermore, the orthographic word might not correspond to any of these.

# What information should a morphological analyzer produce?

The answer depends on the application:

Sometimes it is sufficient to know that רברו is an inflected form of right sometimes morphological information is needed, either as a list of features (רברו is third person, plural, past form of the verb ) or as a structure tree; sometimes it is better to produce a list of phonemes without determining word boundaries. For some applications, the root רבר might be needed. Morphotactics investigates the constraints imposed on the order in which morphemes are combined.

Various kinds of such constraints are known.

Example:

```
על שבעיות \rightarrowשבעיות שבעית שבעי שנע but אל שבעותיא; שבעותיא
```

Types of constraints:

- Constraints on the type of the affix: על is a prefix, ות is a suffix
- Syntactic constraints: [i] converts a noun to an adjective; [ut] converts an adjective to a noun
- Other constraints: in English, "Latin" affixes are attached before "native" ones: non+im+partial non+il+legible \*in+non+partial \*in+non+legible

Ideally, the task of a morphological analysis system would be to break the word down to its component morphemes and determine the meaning of the resulting decomposition.

Things are not that simple because of the often quite drastic effects of phonological rules. A great deal of the effort in constructing computational models of morphology is spent on developing techniques for dealing with phonological rules. Since most computational analyses of morphology assume *written* input, phonological rules are often confused with orthographic ones. Orthographic rules often do not correspond to phonological rules. An orthographic rule that does not correspond to any phonological rule:

```
city+s \rightarrow cities (and not *citys)
bake+ing \rightarrow baking (and not *bakeing)
```

A phonological rule (changing  $[a^j]$  to [i]) is not reflected in the orthography:

```
\mathsf{divine}{+}\mathsf{ity} \to \mathsf{divinity}
```

A phonological rule (stress shift) is not reflected in the orthography:

grammátical  $\rightarrow$  grammaticálity

Examples of phonological rules English: [n] changes to [m] before a labial consonant: **im**possible; **im**pose; **im**mortal Finnish: vowel harmony

Example		
NOM	PART	gloss
taivas	taivas+ <b>ta</b>	sky
puhelin	puheli+ <b>ta</b>	telephone
lakeus	lakeus+ <b>ta</b>	plain
syy	syy+ <b>tä</b>	reason
lyhyt	lyhyt+ <b>tä</b>	short
ystävällinen	ystävällinen+ <b>tä</b>	friendly