

Periphrastic and Auxiliated (compound verbal) Constructions

- in true periphrasis, syntactic constructions fill slots in morphological paradigms associated with (certain) lexemes. This suggests that the interface between syntax and morphology as means of exponences is more complicated than often assumed
- there are difficulties with the idea that tense, aspect and form information from the *words* in these constructions can be monotonically combined to provide a correct and coherent f-structure
- there is further evidence for the separation of morphological and (internal) syntactic features from compound verbal constructions

Latin periphrastic passive: part of the verb paradigm is expressed by an auxiliary + perfective passive participle (Borjars et al. 1997)

Imperfective	active	passive
present	laudat	laudatur
past	laudabat	laudabatur
future	laudabit	laudabitur
Perfective	active	passive
present	laudavit	laudatus/a/um est
past	laudaverat	laudatus/a/um erat
future	laudaverit	laudatus/a/um erit

Perfective	active	passive
1SG (fem)	laudavi	laudata sum
3SG (fem)	laudavit	laudata est
3PL (fem)	laudaverunt	laudatae sunt

Syntax in Morphological Paradigms

A possible view: the morphological paradigm is incomplete: a syntactic construction realising the same content serves.

BUT:

- there is absolute synonymy between the syntactic construction and the “missing” cells
- the periphrasis is more than a simple, compositional syntactic structure
- deponent verbs are passive in form (for active content): thus the form cannot be derived from a syntactic construction which realizes passive content

Deponent and Semi-Deponent Verbs:

loquor: 'I speak'

	Imperfective	Perfective
present	loquitur	locutus/a/um est
past	loquebatur	locutus/a/um erat
future	loquar	locutus/a/um erit

gaudeo: 'I rejoice'

	Imperfective	Perfective
present	gaudet	gavusus/a/um est
past	gaudebat	gavusus/a/um erat
future	gaudebit	gavusus/a/um erit

Conclusion: the syntactic constructions fill cells of a **morphological paradigm**, not a paradigm of **content oppositions**

A Lexicalist Approach (Borjars et al. 1997)

A single f-structure for the periphrastic construction, with auxiliary and participle independently introducing f-structure equations

laudatur

PRED	'lauda<.....>'				
TENSE	PRES				
ASP	IMPERF				
VFORM	FIN				
VOICE	PASS				
MOOD	INDIC				
SUBJ	<table><tr><td>NUM</td><td>SG</td></tr><tr><td>PER</td><td>3</td></tr></table>	NUM	SG	PER	3
NUM	SG				
PER	3				

laudata

PRED	'lauda<.....>'
ASP	PERF
VFORM	PART
VOICE	PASS
SUBJ	[NUM SG]
	[PER 3]
	[GEND FEM]

est

TENSE	PRES
VFORM	FIN
MOOD	INDIC
SUBJ	[NUM SG]
	[PER 3]

laudata est

PRED	'lauda<.....>'
TENSE	PRES
ASP	PERF
VFORM	FIN
VOICE	PASS
MOOD	INDIC
SUBJ	[NUM SG]
	[PER 3]
	[GEND FEM]

- Clash of VFORM features FIN, PART
- *est* is morphologically IMPERF, hence a special entry required for “non-aspectual” *est*
- **laudata fuit*, and so on, are producible
- ASP and VOICE are located in the participle

Similar problems will arise with locating the f-structure values in other languages (eg. MG with a perfect formed from a present imperfective auxiliary and a nonfinite verb, or alternatively, a passive participle)

Conclusions:

- the constructions are specialised
- guiding selection through f-structure features is problematic
- paradigmatic space is not straightforwardly generated from sets of f-structure distinctions, but sets of morphological distinctions

Separating Features is Not Enough

f-structure: ASP VOICE TNS

m-structure: vform, aspect, tense, voice, fin, aux,.....

est

$(\uparrow_{\mu} \text{ aux}) = +$

$(\uparrow_{\mu} \text{ aspect}) = \text{imperf}$

$(\uparrow_{\mu} \text{ dep form}) =_c \text{ part}$

$(\uparrow_{\mu} \text{ dep aux-sel}) =_c \text{ esse}$

$(\uparrow \text{ TNS}) = \text{PRES}$

$(\uparrow_{\mu} \text{ fin}) = +$

$(\uparrow_{\mu} \text{ tense}) = \text{pres}$

$(\uparrow_{\mu} \text{ dep voice}) =_c \text{ pass}$

$(\uparrow \text{ ASP}) +_c \text{ PERF}$

laudata

$(\uparrow_{\mu} \text{ dep form}) = \text{part}$

$(\uparrow_{\mu} \text{ dep aux-sel}) = \text{esse}$

$(\uparrow \text{ ASP}) = \text{PREF}$

$(\uparrow \text{ SUBJ})_{\mu} \text{ gend}) = \text{fem}$

$(\uparrow_{\mu} \text{ dep voice}) = \text{pass}$

$(\uparrow_{\mu} \text{ aspect}) = \text{imperf}$

$(\uparrow \text{ VOICE}) = \text{PASS}$

μ structure

aux	+		
fin	+		
asp	imperf		
tense	pres		
dep	form	part	
	voice	pass	
	aux-sel	esse	

f-structure

ASP	PERF
TENSE	PRES
VOICE	PASS

- separate entry for auxiliary *est*, selecting a participle
- but we recognise that this is morphologically imperfective
- we still lack an m-structure corresponding to the combination of m-features we require (aspect:perf; tense;pres; voice:pass)
- to prevent synthesis passive perfective forms, we need to specify a gap in the paradigm

- A subspace of the synthetic paradigm is realized by an independent multiword construction
- a rule of referral in the sense of Stump
- the theory of predicates of (Ackerman and Webelhuth 1998) appears to capture this constructional overlap

The syntactic construction re-utilised by the morphology is the following:

predicative-participle-construction

Comp [_{AP}....A[m-form:passpart]]

+

Head [_V type:esse, m-aspect:imperf]

*Bibliography

Ackerman, F., and G. Webelhuth. 1998. *A Theory of Predicates*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Borjars, K., N. Vincent, and C. Chapman. 1997. Paradigms, Periphrasis and Pronominal Inflection. In G. Booij (Ed.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1996*, 155–180. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.