Morphemic Analysis
Discussion of its goals and limits

Michael Cysouw
Forschergruppe *Verbale Argumente*, 21 May 2007

Syncretism Principle

(Müller 2006: 163)

Identity of form implies identity of function

(within a certain domain, and unless there is evidence to the contrary)

Müller, Gereon. 2006. Notes on Paradigm Economy. In: Gereon Müller & Jochen Trommer (eds.) *Subanalysis of Argument Encoding in Distributed Morphology*. Leipzig.

General Morphemic Principle

When *similarity of form* matches *similarity in function/meaning*, then this is noteworthy

- Similarity of form

- Similarity of function/meaning

- A match between the two

Evaluation of Morphological Analysis

- What kind of *form similarity* is relevant?

- What kind of *function similarity* is relevant?

- How good does the *match* between the two have to be?

Form Similarity

- whole word

- (groups of) phonemes

- phonemic alternations

- sub-phonemic entities (features)

- supra-phonemic entities
  (stress, syllable structure)

Evaluation: less form-elements is better

Function Similarity

- difficult: no independent way to into semantics (except through language) ?

- anything goes?

- similarities should be somehow 'normal'

Evaluation: typologically frequent whole-word syncretisms are better

Form-Function Match

- Metric: how many exceptions? chance !?

- how good is it for users of the language? (e.g. productivity of nonce-examples)

- how good is the match typologically? (i.e. frequency worldwide comparative)

- how good is the match diachronically? (i.e. locally comparative)

Evaluation: ?

	shutter	mutter	stutter	sputter	flutter			
	shatter	matter		spatter	flatter	tatter	scatter	
					flitter	titter	skitter	jitter
quiver	shiver							
quake	shake	make						
			stammer					yammer

Adapted from Bolinger, D.L. 1950. Rime, assoncance, and morpheme analysis. *Word* 6/2: 131.

th-	wh-
that	what
there	where
then	when
*tho	who
*thich	which
this	*whis
these	*whese
thus	how