

**LIN 621: SEMINAR ON INFLECTIONAL PARADIGMS**

Theoretical interest in inflectional paradigms has risen sharply in recent years. The implicational structure of paradigms is of interest not only to morphologists, but also to historical linguists and typologists, as well as to those interested in issues such as complexity in morphology and syntax, agreement phenomena, and the lexicon. Most languages have some inflection, and a fair number have incredibly rich and tantalizing inflectional systems. In this course we will explore patterns of syncretism, suppletion, historical change in inflection, periphrasis, canonical systems and defectiveness, relevant aspects of morphophonology, and mathematical and computational approaches to inflection. Readings will include mostly very recent work on inflection but also a few older ground-breaking works. We also welcome specific interests that students bring to the course.

**INSTRUCTORS:** David Fertig & Karin Michelson  
**COURSE TIME & PLACE:** M 2:00–4:50, Baldy 105  
**OFFICES:** Baldy 638 (Fertig), Baldy 602 (Michelson)  
**OFFICE HOURS:** M & F 10:30–11:30 (Fertig), Tu 11:00–1:00, (Michelson)  
**E-MAIL:** [fertig@buffalo.edu](mailto:fertig@buffalo.edu), [kmich@buffalo.edu](mailto:kmich@buffalo.edu)

Classes will consist of student-led discussions of readings and discussion of data, possibly of data that students will bring to the seminar. The data can come from any sources. Students should “run” the data by one of the instructors before the day of the class (and preferably a few days before the class).

**REQUIREMENTS:** Presentations of readings/data ..... 50 %  
 Final paper ..... 40 %  
 Participation ..... 10 %

Presentation of the reading should be a critical “review” of the article, not just a summary. The format, at least for the first part of your presentation, should be like a referee report for a journal. These usually have the following organization: (I) The goal of the paper; the main claim; a statement about the source of evidence and nature of the data; (II) a preview of the reviewer’s assessment—does it work? what is the overall recommendation? After this introduction, your presentation should focus on what YOU think is most interesting, or most challenging, or most unsatisfactory (and maybe you have a better solution), and you should end with a list of outstanding questions. In some sense you are “trashing” the work, at the same time as recognizing it as a work of excellence.

We would like a draft of the final paper in advance of the final version. The draft should be submitted by Monday, April 23. The final paper is due Wednesday, May 16.

Because this is a seminar, we include participation in the requirements—good participation can really “make” a seminar—but we recognize not all students make comments in a class at the same level.

## LEARNING OUTCOMES & ASSESSMENT

By the end of this course, students should be able to ...	Method of assessment
explain the meaning and the relevance to current debates in morphological theory of the following terms: paradigm; stem; morphotactics; position class; default; inheritance; principle parts; syncretism, suppletion; periphrasis; cumulative/extended exponence; deponency; separationist hypothesis; morpheme; rule of referral; paradigm economy; no-blur principle; entropy	class discussion
explain and give examples to illustrate the following theoretical oppositions: word-based vs. morpheme-based; lexical vs. inferential; incremental vs. realizational; constructive vs. abstractive; exponence-based vs. implicative; syntagmatic/compositional vs. paradigmatic/configurational	class discussion
identify the key distinguishing characteristics and name some of the major proponents of the following theoretical approaches to inflectional morphology: traditional Word-And-Paradigm Morphology; Paradigm-Function Morphology; Information-Based Morphology; Construction Morphology; Network Morphology	class discussion
analyze complex morphological data sets in accordance with at least one of the approaches discussed in the seminar and compare the pros and cons of this approach to others	class activities
become the class expert on some aspect of morphological theory related to inflectional paradigms	presentation of reading; term project
demonstrate in-depth understanding of some aspect of morphological theory related to inflectional paradigms and make an original contribution to scholarship in this area	term project

### COURSE POLICIES:

Incompletes. If you are considering discussing the possibility of an incomplete with your instructor(s), please familiarize yourself first with UB's official policy at:

<https://catalog.buffalo.edu/policies/explanation.html>

Academic Integrity. All students should be sure that they understand the University's Academic Integrity policy before completing any assignments or taking any tests. If you have any questions or concerns about the policy, please discuss them with your instructor(s). You will find the policy at:

<https://catalog.buffalo.edu/policies/integrity.html>

Accessibility Resources. If you require classroom or testing accommodations due to a disability, please contact Accessibility Resources, located at 60 Capen Hall. AR can be reached by phone at (716) 645-2608 or by email using the form at the website below. Please inform your instructor(s) as soon as possible about your needs so that we can coordinate your accommodations.

<http://www.buffalo.edu/studentlife/who-we-are/departments/accessibility.html>

## TOPICS & READINGS

Week	Date	Topic & Reading
2	Feb 5	<u>Separationist morphology and the morpheme</u> Aronoff. 1994. Morphology by Itself. Ch. 1 Aronoff. 2016. Unnatural Kinds. <i>Edited volume</i> . Bye & Svenonius. 2012. Non-concatenative morphology as epiphenomenon. <i>Edited vol. OR</i> Kramer. 2016. Syncretism in PFM and DM. <i>Ed. volume</i> .
3	Feb 12	<u>Exponence-based versus implicative models</u> Bonami & Stump. 2017. Paradigm Function Morphology. <i>Handbook</i> . Ackerman & Malouf. 2017. Implicative Relations in word-based morphological systems. <i>Handbook</i> .
4	Feb 19	<u>Paradigm Economy</u> Carstairs-McCarthy. 1994. Infl. Classes, Gender, & the Principle of Contrast. <i>Lg</i> . Blevins. 2004. Inflectional classes and Economy. <i>Edited volume</i>
5	Feb 26	<u>Exponence 1</u> Coates. 2000. Exponence. <i>Handbook</i> .
6	Mar 5	<u>Exponence 2</u> Harris. 2000. Exuberant Exponence in Batsbi. <i>NLLT</i> . OR Harris & Samuel. 2011. Perception of Exuberant Exponence in Batsbi. <i>Language</i> .
7	Mar 12	<u>Position classes</u> Stump. 1993. Position Classes and Morphological Theory. <i>Yearbk of Morphology</i> Crysmann. 2017. Inferential-realizational morphology w/o rule blocks. <i>Ed. vol</i> .
<b>Mar 19</b>		<b>SPRING BREAK</b>
8	Mar 26	<u>(More) morphotactics</u> Crysmann & Bonami. 2015. Variable morphotactics in IBM. <i>J. of Linguistics</i> . Stump. 2017. Rule conflation in an inferential-realizational. <i>Acta Ling. Acad</i> .
9	Apr 2	<u>Complexity</u> Baerman. 2012. Paradigmatic Chaos in Nuer. <i>Language</i> . Baerman. 2016. Seri verb classes: Morphosyntactic motivation ... <i>Language</i> .
10	Apr 9	<u>Syncretism</u> Ackema & Neeleman. 2013. Person features and syncretism. <i>NLLT</i> . Albright & Fuss. 2012. Syncretism. <i>Handbook</i>
11	Apr 16	<u>Paradigms in phonology 1</u> Albright. 2011. Paradigms. <i>Handbook</i> . McCarthy. 2005. Optimal Paradigms. <i>Edited volume</i> .
12	Apr 23	<u>Paradigms in phonology 2</u> Albright. 2010. Base-driven leveling in Yiddish verb paradigms. <i>NLLT</i> . De Lacy. 2012. Morphophonological Polarity. <i>Edited volume</i> .
13	Apr 30	<u>Suppletion and Periphrasis</u> Corbett. 2007. Canonical Typology, Suppletion, and Possible Words. <i>Language</i> . Kiparsky. 2006. Blocking & Periphrasis in Infl. Paradigms. <i>Yearbk of Morphology</i>
14	May 7	<u>Historical trends</u> Igartua. 2015. From cumulative to separative exponence. <i>Language</i> .