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Introduction

- Inflectional periphrases: multi-word constructions integrated in an inflectional paradigm.
- Inflectional periphrases are not the result of free syntactic combinations, but rather realize cells in the inflectional paradigms of lexemes.


- Our claim: None of these proposals is compatible with all the desirable design properties of a theory of periphrasis as inflection.

- New proposal to solve this problem: periphrastic predicates as collocations.
Design properties of a theory of periphrasis
True periphrases integrate inflectional paradigms

- Not all multiword expressions with inflection-like content are inflectional periphrases.
- Persian has three ways of expressing progressivity:
  - Implicitly, by using an imperfective form
    
    (1) Maryam madrase mi-raft.
        Maryam school IPFV-go.PST[3SG]
        ‘Maryam was going to school.’/‘Maryam used to go to school.’

  - Combining a finite form of dâštan ‘have’ and a finite form of the main verb.
    
    (2) Maryam dâšt madrase mi-raft.
        Maryam have.PST[3SG] school IPFV-go.PST[3SG]
        ‘Maryam was going to school.’

  - Using the predicative adjective mašqul ‘occupied’ and an infinitive main verb
    
    (3) Maryam mašqul-e madrase raft-an ast.
        Maryam occupied-EZ school go-INF COP.PRS.3SG
        ‘Maryam was going to school.’
True periphrases integrate inflectional paradigms

- Despite identical semantics, only the second strategy is undisputably an inflectional periphrase:
  - No subjunctive progressive

(4) * Fekr mi-kon-am ke dâr-ad be-dav-ad.
   thought IPFV-do-.PRS-1SG that have-PRS-3SG SBJV-run.PRS-3SG
    (intended) ‘I think that he is running.’

(5) Fekr mi-kon-am ke mašqul-e davidan bâš-ad.
   thought IPFV-do-1.SG that occupied-EZ run-INF be.SBJV-3.SG

- No negative progressive

(6) a. * Maryam na-dâr-ad (ne-)mi-dav-ad.
    Maryam NEG-have.PRS-3SG NEG-IPFV-run.PRS-3SG
     (intended) ‘Maryam is not running.’

  b. Maryam mašqul-e davidan nist.
     Maryam occupied-EZ run-INF NEG.COP.PRS.3SG

Periphrases fill cells in a paradigm whose geometry is partly arbitrary
Design properties of a theory of periphrasis

Auxiliaries have normal paradigms

- Many attempts to treat periphrases as ordinary syntax.
- Usually leads to systematic overgeneration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PERFECTIVE</th>
<th>IMPERFECTIVE</th>
<th>PERFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESENT</strong></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>mi-xar-ad</td>
<td>xarid-e-ast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR.</td>
<td>xarid</td>
<td>mi-xarid</td>
<td>xarid-e bud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND.</td>
<td>xarid-e-ast</td>
<td>mi-xarid-e-ast</td>
<td>xarid-e bud-e-ast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBJUNCTIVE</strong></td>
<td>be-xar-ad</td>
<td></td>
<td>xarid-e bâš-ad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of the Persian perfect periphrase (Bonami & Samvelian, 2009)

- Only way out:
  1. Either assume some kind of competition between morphology and syntax (e.g. Poser 1992, Bresnan 2001, Kiparsky 2005)
     - Technically and conceptually problematic
   - Strongly implausible
  2. Assume that all auxiliaries are deponent (here: \([\text{PRF} -]\) forms expressing \([\text{PRF} +]\))
     - Strongly implausible
Arbitration between synthesis and periphrasis follows the logic of Pāṇini’s principle

- Tundra Nenets nouns: declension is synthetic in general, periphrastic for local cases in the dual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>tex°h</td>
<td>tiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>tim</td>
<td>tex°h</td>
<td>tí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>tih</td>
<td>tex°h</td>
<td>tíq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>ten°h</td>
<td>tex°h nyah</td>
<td>tex°q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>tex°na</td>
<td>tex°h nyana</td>
<td>tex°qna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>texød°</td>
<td>tex°h nyad°</td>
<td>texøt°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROS</td>
<td>tew°na</td>
<td>tex°h nyamna</td>
<td>teqm°na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absolute subparadigm of the Tundra Nenets noun Ti ‘male reindeer’ (Salminen 1997)

This is despite the existence of a perfectly well-formed candidate synthetic form tex°h
Arbitration between synthesis and periphrasis follows the logic of Pāṇini’s principle

- **Czech verbs:** Past conjugation is periphrastic except in the 3rd person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>pekl jsem</td>
<td>pekla jsem</td>
<td>peklo jsem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>pekli jsme</td>
<td>pekly jsme</td>
<td>pekla jsme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pekl jsi</td>
<td>pekla jsi</td>
<td>peklo jsi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>pekli jste</td>
<td>pekly jste</td>
<td>pekla jste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>pekl</td>
<td>pekla</td>
<td>peklo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>pekli</td>
<td>pekly</td>
<td>pekla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Past of the verb PÉCT ‘to bake’

- This is despite the existence of a perfectly well-formed (and otherwise obligatory) 3rd person copula: 3SG je, 3PL jsou

뇌 Favors a view where arbitration between synthesis and periphrasis happens within the inflectional system.
Periphrasis is independent of phrase structure

The parts of a periphrase can stand in varying phrase-structural configurations (Bonami & Webelhuth, in press):

(7) a. dass das Buch jemand [VC gekauft hat] CPZR the book nobody buy.PST.PCPL have.PRS.3SG ‘that nobody bought the book’ (German)


c. Paul [VP has [VP read that book ]]. (English)

d. [S Maryam dâšt [S madrase mi-raft]]. Maryam have.PST[3SG] school IPFV-go.PST[3SG] ‘Maryam was going to school.’ (Persian)

e. [S Toj njama [CP da e v kâštata]]. he not-have THAT be.PRS[3SG] v house.DEF ‘He will not be in the house.’ (Bulgarian)
Grammatical relations between parts of a periphrase

- The parts of a periphrase stand in a syntactic head-argument or head-modifier relationship.

(8) a. John has \[\text{VP left the room}\].
    b. \[\text{AP more important}\]

- Syntactic operations can affect parts of a periphrase, as long as they do not disrupt the grammatical relations.

(9) Subject-auxiliary inversion
    a. Has John \[\text{VP left the room}\]?
    b. May John \[\text{VP leave the room}\]?

(10) Topicalization
    a. \[\text{VP Left the room}\] \[\text{S I believe S he has ___}\].
    b. \[\text{VP Leave the room}\] \[\text{S I believe S he may ___}\].
Inflectional systems are best described in word-and-paradigm approaches.


Syntactic systems are best described in phrase-structural terms, as incrementally built combinations of signs.


In Stump’s (2001) terms, inflection is inferential-realizational, syntax is lexical-incremental.

An adequate theory of periphrasis should be compatible with such a position.
Current approaches to periphrasis

None of the existing proposals is satisfactory.

- **Ackerman and Webelhuth 1998**: syntax of periphrasis is too inflexible to handle extraction or modification.
- **Sadler and Spencer 2001, Ackerman and Stump 2004**: opposite problem: syntax too unconstrained or details not worked out.
- **Bonami and Samvelian 2009**: the morphological component fails to be completely realizational.
- **Bonami and Webelhuth (in press)**: Panini’s Principle does not apply within the morphology, can’t deal with periphrases that rest on the modifier-head relation.
An alternative: periphrases as collocations
The intuition

- The main element of a periphrase requires the presence of a selector in the same local environment.
- This is reminiscent of the mutual cooccurrence requirements we find in collocations.
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The intuition

The same goes for modification structures.

Collocation vs. periphrase:

- **Collocation**
  - N′
  - \( M \)
  - Adj
  - red
  - N′
  - M
  - H
  - tape

- **Periphrase**
  - AdjP
  - \( M \)
  - H
  - more
  - \( M \)
  - Adv
  - Adj
  - important

We adopt an analysis in the spirit of Soehn & Sailer 2003, but with important modifications.
- Words can carry a REVERSE-SELECTION requirement.
- This amounts to asking for a selector to be present.
- The distance between selector and selectee can be as long as the grammar allows independently for that kind of selection relation.

Inflection rules may produce REV-SEL requirements.
Consequences of reverse selection

If a word carries a REV-SEL requirement, then it (or one of its projections) should be selected by a word whose morphological description unifies with that requirement.
Since we rely on the HPSG theory of selection, extraction of parts of periphrases is predicted to be possible without any further stipulations.
Periphrasis as collocation: the details
**INFL and HEAD**

- Introduction of the feature **INFL** on words:
  - **INFL** is what morphology realizes, **HEAD** is what syntax and semantics examine.
  - **INFL** features often have corresponding **HEAD** features, but there can be mismatches.
  - For ordinary words, **INFL** relates to **HEAD** lexically.
  - In periphrases, this relation is mediated by syntax.

```plaintext
[head
  [lid leave]
  [vform prs]
  [prf]
]

[infl
  [lid leave]
  [vform prs]
  [prf]
]
```

In periphrases, the relation is mediated by syntax.
INFL and HEAD on periphrase-inducing main verbs

- The periphrase-inducing main verb needs to be a nonfinite form in terms of HEAD, because it heads a nonfinite VP.
  - Can carry constituent negation: He hasn’t [not left]
- But it needs to have a head value distinct from that of an ordinary present participle, so that the auxiliary can select specifically for it.
INFL and HEAD on auxiliaries

The auxiliary needs to have the right INFL features to ensure its correct inflection.
Information flow in periphrases

We now need to ensure the right information flow:

- The blue path:
  - Constraint on periphrastic words
  - Inheritance constraint on auxiliary lexemes

- The red path:
  - REV-SEL requirement induced by inflection rule, cashed out on the auxiliary
  - Constraint on nonperiphrastic words, applied to auxiliary

```
VP

head
| lid          2 | leave |
| vform [4]prs |
| prf 3+       |

infl
| lid          2 | leave |
| have-aux     |
| vform [4]prs |
| prf          |
| ms           |
| has          |
```

```
VP

head
| lid          2 | leave |
| vform pst-ptcp|
| prf 3+       |

infl
| ms           |
| vform [4]prs |
| prf 3+       |

```
The Reverse Selection Principle

We formulate the Reverse Selection Principle in terms of selection for INFL from a set-valued word level feature REV-SEL:

(11) Projection
   a. Every sign is a projection of itself
   b. A phrase is a projection of its head
   c. A coordination is a projection of each of its daughters

(12) Selection
   a. A sign selects all signs whose synsem occur on its ARG-ST
   b. A sign selects any sign whose synsem occurs on its MOD

(13) Reverse selection principle
   If a word $w$ carries a reverse selection requirement $s$ in its REV-SEL, then $s$ must be token-identical to the INFL value of a word $w'$ selecting for a projection of $w$. 
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The Reverse Selection Principle illustrated
Producing reverse selection requirements

- We embed a version of Paradigm Function Morphology (Stump, 2001) as a morphological component of our HPSG grammar.
- Realization rules may:
  - modify the phonological representation of their input
  - add reverse selectional requirements on the syntactic context.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PHON} \ X, \ \sigma : & \left[ \text{VFORM} \ pst-ptcp \right] \\
\text{REV-SEL} \ & \rightarrow \left[ \text{PHON} \ X \text{ed} \right]
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PHON} \ X, \ \sigma : & \left[ \text{PRF} \ + \right] \\
\text{REV-SEL} \ & \rightarrow \left[ \text{PHON} \ \underbrace{\text{refer} \left( X, \sigma ! \left[ \text{VFORM} \ pst-ptcp \right] \right)}_{\text{left in has left is not a past participle, but a present perfect whose phonology is referred to that of a past participle.}} \right]
\end{align*}
\]
Illustration

Periphrasis as collocation: the details
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Periphrastic vs. nonperiphrastic words

Some features project from INFL to HEAD if they are not used for periphrastic expression of some other feature.

(14) \[ \text{word} \rightarrow \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{REV-SEL} \{ \} \leftrightarrow \text{HEAD} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{VFORM} \ 1 \end{array} \right] \right) \\
\text{INFL} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{MS} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{VFORM} \ 1 \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right) \]
Plain vs. auxiliary lexemes

Some features project from INFL to HEAD only for nonauxiliary lexemes

(15) nonaux-lxm →

```
[ HEAD
  [ LID 1
  PRF 2 ]

[ INFL
  [ LID 1
  MS  PRF 2 ]

  [ VP
    [ head
      [ lid leave
        vform 4
        prf + ]
    ]

    [ infl
      [ lid have-aux
        ms
        vform 4
        prf − ]
    ]

  [ VP
    [ head
      [ lid 2 leave
        ms
        vform pst-ptcp
        prf 3+ ]
    ]

    [ infl
      [ lid 2 leave
        ms
        vform 4
        prf 3+ ]
    ]

  has
  ]
```
Lexical entries for auxiliaries

```
lexeme

HEAD
LID 1
PRF 3

INFL
LID have-aux
MS [PRF -]

CONT 4

ARG-ST <5,
HEAD
VFORM
PRF

SUBJ <5>
CONT 4

<5>
```
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Auxiliary lexical entries: illustration

No spurious ambiguity: because it selects for a [PRF +] complement, the auxiliary cannot combine with an ordinary ([PRF −]) participle.
Stacking periphrases

Periphrasis as collocation: the details
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The rule for perfect should not be applicable to progressive forms, so that we can prevent *is having left.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{PHON} \quad \{\} \quad \text{REV-SEL} \quad \{\} \\
&\text{PRF} \quad + \\
&\text{PROG} \quad - \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{PHON} \quad \{\} \quad \text{REV-SEL} \quad \{\} \\
&\text{LID} \quad \text{have-aux} \\
&\text{MORSYN} \quad \sigma! \quad \text{PRF} \quad - \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{PHON} \quad \{\} \quad \text{REV-SEL} \quad \{\} \\
&\text{LID} \quad \text{be-aux} \\
&\text{MORSYN} \quad \sigma! \quad \text{PROG} \quad - \\
\end{align*}
\]
Periphrasis by modification

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PHON} & \ X & \text{REV-SEL} & \ \{} & \ , & \ \sigma & : & \text{GRADE comp} & \rightarrow & \text{PHON} & \ \text{worse} & \text{REV-SEL} & \ \{} \\
\text{LID} & \ \text{bad} & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\text{PHON} & \ X & \text{REV-SEL} & \ \{} & \ , & \ \sigma & : & \text{GRADE comp} & \rightarrow & \text{PHON} & \ X \text{er} & \text{REV-SEL} & \ \{} \\
\text{LID} & \ \text{class-A} & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\text{PHON} & \ X & \text{REV-SEL} & \ \{} & \ , & \ \sigma & : & \text{GRADE comp} & \rightarrow & \text{PHON} & \ X & \text{REV-SEL} & \ \{} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Avoiding unwarranted generalizations

It is tempting to elevate constraints on feature percolation to the level of principles.

This is unwarranted: much cross-linguistic and language-internal variation.

In familiar situations, paradigmatic opposition between the form of the main verb and the form of the auxiliary. In the Persian progressive, tense and mood expressed jointly on the main verb and auxiliary.

In familiar situations, periphrastic expression of some feature relies on the exponents for a different feature set on the auxiliary. In Tundra nenets, local case is expressed by the congruent local case of the auxiliary postposition.
Conclusions
Inflectional periphrases

- are not the result of free syntactic combinations.
- Rather: they realize cells in the inflectional paradigms of lexemes.
- None of the previous proposals is compatible with all the desirable design properties of a theory of periphrasis as inflection.
- New proposal to solve this problem: periphrastic predicates as collocations.
Conclusions

**Syntax:**
- Words can carry a REVERSE-SELECTION requirement.
- This amounts to asking for a specific selector to be present in the local environment of the word.
- The distance between selector and selectee can be as long as the grammar allows independently for the selection relation involved.

**Morphology:**
- The paradigm function may produce
  - phonological effects, and in addition
  - REV-SEL requirements.

The theory captures the major desiderata for a theory of periphrasis as inflection:
- The two or more exponents can stand in various syntactic relationships.
- The degree of locality of these relationships is independent of periphrasis.
- Gaps in the paradigms of auxiliaries follow from paradigm structure.
- The morphological component is realizational rather than incremental.
- Arbitration between synthesis and periphrasis is decided within the morphological component.