MORPHOLOGICAL CHANGE (Part 1)

Morphology is not isolated from other components of the grammar -- it integrates with phonology and syntax.

Phonological processes may become morphologized, e.g., *foot - feet* : historically, this alternation was part of phonology

>   *fo:ti > OE fe:t > ME *feet* [fi:t]
>   the Pl. marker: -*i* conditioned an umlaut process.

Study 15.60, pp. 359-360.

The loss of the final -*i* meant that the changed stem vowel was no longer predictable, becoming instead a morphological fact about a particular word.

Syntactic features may become morphological: e.g., pronouns may become person markers (in many FU languages):

>   V + -*m*   (< me) Sg1
>   V + -*t*   (< te)   Sg2

This process is termed *grammaticalization*: the morphologisation of syntactic elements.

Morphological facts cannot therefore be divorced entirely from phonology and/or syntax. As a result, theories of morphological change are not well developed within the context of a full grammar; most research concentrates on one well-documented internal morphological change:
analogy.
    ↓
 a linguistic process involving generalization from one set of conditions to another set of conditions

Examples of the interaction of the two principal bases for morphological change: (i) phonological change, (ii) analogy.

PIE * bher- *bear*

Skr.	bhara:mi	*I bear*
	bharasi	*thou bearest*
	bharati	*he/she/it bears*

Skr.   bhar- (root) + thematic vowel + endings: -mi -si -ti

The root conveys the lexical meaning, the –m- -s- -t- are person markers
and the –i indicate the Prs. tense.

Greek:

phero   *I bear* (compare: Latin fero:)
phereis   *thou bearest*
pherei   *he/she/it bears*

PIE Prs Sg1   *bhero:

What about the Skr. form bhara:mi   ???

-mi -- by spread from the conjugation: speakers of Skr. aimed at achieving
parallelism between the three Sg forms ---*analogy*! (-mi survived in
English: *am* as in *I am*).

Sg. 2 in Greek:

        Deletion of intervocalic *s*   *PIE bheresi > Gk. *pherei

        ↓

        Phonological change!
        Gk. imperfect Sg2: epheres
        The *s* from this form was influencing the Prs Sg2 form   ➝   *analogy*!

        ****

Leveling consists in the complete or partial elimination of morphophonemic alternations
within paradigms (paradigm: set of inflected forms of a given word).

The motivation for leveling is the "one meaning - one form" principle.

Alternations which do not signal differences in meaning tend to be eliminated.

Two examples: English and Latin

English strong verbs:

        OE strong verbs: seven classes based on word-internal vowel alternations;
         four principal parts.

```
Infinitive                          (I)
Sg 1 and Sg 3 preterite indicative  (II)
Preterite indicative Pl             (III)
Preterite Participle                (IV)
```

Examples:

Classes

	I.	II.	III	IV	
1.	dri:fan	dra:f	drifon	drifen	*drive*
2.	ce:osan	ce:as	curon	coren	*choose*
3.	findan	fand	fundon	funden	*find*
4.	beran	bær	bæ:ron	boren	*bear*
5.	sprecan	spræc	spræcon	sprecen	*speak*
6.	standan	sto:d	sto:don	standen	*stand*
7.	feallan	fe:oll	fe:ollon	feallen	*fall*

In addition to the strong verbs in OE there was a large number of weak (or regular) verbs, with fewer forms; they were *productive*!

every new verb was conjugated in accordance with the regular conjugation paradigm.

Weak verbs had fewer forms, and the preterite Sg and Pl differed only in the ending:

lufian	lufode	lufodon	lufod	*love*

Analogical reduction of the strong verb set $\rightarrow$ leveling! Several ways may be observed, for example: selecting either the Sg or Pl vowel in the preterite (e.g., in "drive" the vowel in the Sg was generalized, NE *drive drove driven*), or generalizing the vowel of the preterite participle (e.g., in NE "bear" *bear bore borne*).

Latin:
Stage 1: Before 400 BC

honos   (Nom.) 'honour'
honoìs-is   (Gen.)
honoìs-em   (Acc.)
etc.

Later, a sound change took place: s > r / V__ V
The effect of the sound change was to create two different forms of the stem, *honos-* and *honor-*

Stage 2:   *rhotacism*

honos   (Nom.)
honoìr-is   (Gen.)
honoìr-em   (Acc.)
etc.

The resulting paradigm was irregular in having two stem shapes. Analogy: a regular paradigm was created in Latin, matching the *r* of the rest of the paradigm..

Stage 3:   *after 200 BC*

honor   (Nom.)
honoìr-is   (Gen.)
honoìr-em   (Acc.)
etc.

Proportional (or four part) analogy: the mechanism of extension involves the construction of a proportion, encoding a relationship between four terms.

The proportional model operates by generalizing a pattern of morphological relationships between given forms (*a* and *a'*) to forms such as (*b* and *X*) which previously did not exhibit this pattern.

Example: it is the result of this process that the Pl. of *cow* today is *cows* instead of the earlier *kine* (which now survives only marginally in old-fashioned poetic usage).

$$a \quad : \quad a'$$

$$b \quad : \quad X = b'$$

stone :   *stones*
cow   :   X = *cow-s*

For proportional analogy to take place, there must be a *morphological relationship* between the words which make up the proportion. Proportions based on purely phonetic/phonological similarities such as one between *ring* (verb) and *king* (noun) do not undergo this type of change:

ring :   *rang*
king :   X = *kang**

The proportional model for change should be a pattern of derivation not limited to one lexical item.

stone   :   *stones*
arm   :   *arms*
dog   :   *dogs*

.....   :   .....
cow   :   X = *cow-s*

The condition most conducive to systematic application of proportional analogy is *productivity*.