1983

The relationship of morphology and syntax: Evidence from Quechua

David J. Weber
SIL-UND

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/sil-work-papers>

Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Weber, David J. (1983) "The relationship of morphology and syntax: Evidence from Quechua," *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session*: Vol. 27, Article 10.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31356/silwp.vol27.10>

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/sil-work-papers/vol27/iss1/10>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.commonson@library.und.edu.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTAX: EVIDENCE FROM QUECHUA

David J. Weber

1. Introduction
2. How to Integrate Morphology and Syntax -- A Proposal
3. Arguments from Quechua
 - 3.1 Agreement
 - 3.2 Case Markers
 - 3.3 [Object verb]-suffix
 - 3.4 Switch Reference "anomalies"
 - 3.5 Subject-Object Marking System
 - 3.6 Agglutinative Tendencies
 - 3.7 ka- 'be' and Object Markers
 - 3.8 Passive is Phrasal
4. Other Arguments
 - 4.1 Derivational Versus Inflectional Morphology
 - 4.2 "Wrong-way" Clitization
 - 4.3 Arguments Against the Priority of Words
5. Conclusions and Consequences

1. Introduction

Muysken [7] argues from Quechua data for the separation of morphology and syntax. After quoting Pike's claim [9],

"For the description of some languages it is not accurate or helpful to postulate a sharp morphology-syntax dichotomy."

Muysken continues:

"Here I would like to argue in detail that it is both accurate and helpful to postulate that dichotomy." (page 279)

I intend to show that Muysken is wrong,¹ that Quechua provides considerable evidence that morphology and syntax must be closely integrated, and that strictly separating them makes capturing certain regularities of the language--if not impossible--at least very difficult. I take the position that morphology and syntax are not distinct components, and that they should be treated as a single domain, called *morpho-syntax*.

Other recent work suggests that morphology and syntax must not be treated as autonomous components. For example, Anderson [2] argues that inflectional morphology must interact with syntax. He still assumes that word formation--which treats derivational morphology--is autonomous.²

Sadock [10] goes farther in showing that word formation cannot be autonomous; he writes:

"The language thus falsifies pronouncements concerning the independence of syntax and word formation based on data from languages that are typologically very different from Greenlandic." (page 300, abstract)

This paper is organized as follows:

- Section 2 outlines a proposal as to how morphology and syntax might be integrated.
- Section 3 gives various arguments from Quechua³ that morphology and syntax must not be strictly segregated. These arguments (and those of section 4) do not depend on the proposal of section 2, so they will stand whether or not that proposal has merit.
- Section 4 outlines some data from other languages that support the notion that there is no strict morphology-syntax boundary.
- Section 5 gives some consequences and conclusions of this study.

¹It is not my purpose here to review Muysken [7]; some criticisms are outlined in Appendix 1.

²Anderson suggests that interaction with syntax is the essential difference between inflectional and derivational morphology.

³Unless otherwise stated, the data is from Huallaga (Huanuco) Quechua; this central Peruvian dialect is quite similar to the Tarma dialect on which Muysken's paper is based.

2. How to Integrate Morphology and Syntax--A Proposal

It is widely assumed that phrases and larger units are formed from words, and that these words exist (in some sense) prior to or independently of the larger units in which they occur. A corollary of this view is that word-formation processes are independent of the processes that produce these larger units. Given such assumptions, surface structures like 1 are assumed to be correct simply because a unique node dominates each word:⁴

(1) $[[\text{extreme}_{\text{adj}} + \text{ly}]_{\text{adv}} \quad [\text{slow}_{\text{adj}} + \text{ly}]_{\text{adv}}]_{\text{adv}}$

Structures like 2 are regarded as unnatural (or dismissed as "semantic") because *-ly* has within its scope the phrase *extreme-ly slow*:

(2) $[[[\text{extreme}_{\text{adj}} + \text{ly}]_{\text{adv}} \quad \text{slow}_{\text{adj}}]_{\text{adj}} + \text{ly}]_{\text{adv}}$

Perhaps it is the assumption that such structures express part-whole relationships that makes 2 appear unseemly. However, it is very reasonable if *-ly* is seen as operating on an adjective to yield an adverb, whether this adjective is a single word or a larger unit.

This predisposition to see structure as expressing part-whole relationships has led to regarding word formation and the combinatorix of larger units as distinct in nature. Methodologically they are treated as separate domains of study, the former called *morphology*, the latter *syntax*. Theoretically they are considered to be separate components of grammar, the former called the *word formation component*, the latter *syntax*.

In the face of this, I would like to propose the following:

Grammatical strings of morphemes are generated by a single set of rules. There is no a priori distinction between phrase structure rules and word formation rules.

⁴ A node can be thought of as making the claim that what it dominates is an autonomous part.

These rules may be expressed in a form similar to phrase structures rules.⁵ Consider a simple intransitive sentence like 3:

- (3) Juan aywa-n
 John go-3
 'John goes.'

Traditionally 3 would be assigned a surface structure like 4, generated by the phrase structure rule $S \rightarrow NP VP$ and the inflectional suffix is considered to come about by an "agreement" rule.

The alternative I propose is to assign a surface structure like 6, generated by 5, where the subscript indicates person agreement between the NP and the person marking suffix:

- (5) $V0 \rightarrow (NP_i) V1\text{-}person_i$

In the nodes V0 and V1, "V" can be thought of as indicating "predicate." The integer following indicates the morphological valence of the word, i.e. the number of arguments for which this predicate lacks person marking, to be a complete word. "S" will be used for "substantive" and "R" for "adverb". Thus *aywa-* is a V1 because it is a predicate which lacks a single argument (referring to the one who goes). When this argument is added, the predicate becomes a complete predication, and thus is a V0. In *maqa-ma-n* 'he hits me' each of the affixes (suffixes) reduces the valence by one:

- (7)
<i>maqa-</i>	'hit'	has valence 2
<i>maqa-ma:-</i>	'hit me'	has valence 1
<i>maqa-ma-n</i>	'he hit me'	has valence 0

⁵A similar proposal is found in Selkirk [11].

Let us consider a simple transitive sentence like 8:⁶

- (8) Juan noqa-ta maqa-ma-n
 John me-ACC hit- $\Rightarrow$ 1-3
 'John hits me.'

Traditionally this would be analyzed as 9, generated by the rules $S \rightarrow NP VP$ and $VP \rightarrow NP V$ with the verb being produced by word-formation processes independent of the syntax:

The alternative I propose is 12, generated by the rules 10 and 11 where "acc" "obj" and "subj" are suffixes and the subscript indicates person agreement between the NP and the person marking suffix:

- (10) $V0 \rightarrow (NP_i) V1-subj_i$
 (11) $V1 \rightarrow (NP_i-acc) V2-obj_i$
 (12)

What is different about these structures? Principally, they differ in that suffixes often have more than one word in their scope, and by allowing the rules to insert lexical material. The following further illustrates the extent to which suffixes may have units larger than a single word in their scope:⁷

⁶"3 $\Rightarrow$ 1" is notation for 'a third person subject and a first person object'. " $\Rightarrow$ 1" is used either to indicate 'first person object' or to refer to -ma:, the first person object marker. Of course, similar notation is used for other persons; 12 is used for first person plural inclusive.

⁷This example is from Huaraz (Ancash) Quechua; as reported by Helen Larsen in an unpublished paper.

- (13) [[[mangor asnu] -pa wirpa-n]-naw sinqa]-yog china
 mangor donkey-GEN lip-3P -SIM nose -HAVING girl

'a girl with a nose like a mangor donkey's lip'

- (14) [[["Ama miku-y-chu" ni-sha-:] yoora]-pa wayu+y-nin]-ta...
 not eat-2IMP-NEG say-sub-1P tree-GEN fruit-3P-OBJ

'...the fruit of the tree of which I said "Do not eat it."'

Are structures such as espoused here reasonable? We will now turn to various justifications for them.

3. Arguments from Quechua

In many and diverse ways, the structures proposed in the section 1 are superior to alternatives based on part-whole relationships. This section attempts to demonstrate this.

3.1. Agreement

Traditionally, agreement marking (e.g. the subject and object markers on the verb) is considered to come about by "agreement rules." These--frequently dismissed with a good measure of hand waving--fix up surface structures after the other generative process. They are sensitive to features brought by the inserted lexical items. One problem for this approach is that, for cases here there is agreement marking but not overt substantive, it requires first inserting the material, accessing the relevant features (and usually copying them to the verb) and then deleting the overt substantive.

In the alternative proposed here, agreement comes about in the course of generation by the same rule which generates the overt substantive phrase. This is simpler than the traditional approach in that (i) it is not necessary to reconsider a structure after generation, to decide what should be agreeing with what, and (ii) it does not require copying features from the substantive to the verb. The problem of specifying agreement features when there is no overt substantive simply does not arise.

3.2. Case markers

Case markers have in their scope the whole noun phrase to which they are attached. This helps explain a number of facts. Three will be mentioned. First, nominal modifiers (adjectives, relative clauses) generally precede their head; e.g.:

- (15) [Maqa-sha-n runa]-ta rika-:.
hit-sub-3P man -ACC see-1

'I see the man who hit him.'

They also occur in the opposite order, but note, the case marker stays on the rightmost element:

- (16) [Runa maqa-sha-n]-ta rika-:.
man hit-sub-3P -ACC see-1

'I see the man who hit him.'

To capture this fact, if the scope of the case marker is regarded as including all the substantive phrase, then it is unnecessary to mention the case marker. But if the case marker is regarded as having only the head in its scope, then the rule must mention how the case marker becomes dissociated from the head and ends up on the modifier. Thus by simplicity of rule we reason that the case marker has the entire phrase in its scope.

Second, elements of a single noun phrase may occur discontinuously, but when this is the case, each element bears (a copy of) the case marker of the noun phrase. For example, 15 could also be said as one of 17:

- (17) a. [maqa-sha-n Ø]-ta rikaa runa-ta
b. [Ø runa]-ta rikaa maqa-sha-n-ta
c. [Ø runa]-ta maqa-sha-n-ta rikaa
d. [maqa-sha-n Ø]-ta runa-ta rikaa

'I see the man who hit him.'

A simple rule can handle all these cases:

A constituent may be moved out of the scope of a case marker, but if so, it must bear a copy of that marker.

This rule is simple precisely because it presupposes that the scope of the case marker includes all of the noun phrase.

Third, the deletion of a head operates within the scope of a case marker. For example, from 18a the head (*meesa* 'table') can be deleted, in which case *-ta* 'ACC' ends up following *lasaquin*. Similarly, from 18b, *lasaq* can be deleted, resulting in *-nin* following *sumaq*.

- (18) a. [[Sumaq lasaq]-nin meesa]-ta apamu-nki!
 very heavy -SUP table -ACC bring-2IMP
- b. [[Sumaq lasaq]-nin Ø]-ta apamu-nki!
 very heavy -SUP -ACC bring-2IMP
- c. [[Sumaq Ø]-nin Ø]-ta apamu-nki!
 very -SUP -ACC bring-2IMP
- 'Bring the heaviest table.'

3.3. [Object verb]-suffix

In some cases the object phrase and the verb root/stem form a constituent to which some following verbal suffix is sensitive. *-mu* has two rather distinct meanings, depending on the verb to which it is attached. With a motion verb (like "go") it means '(motion) toward here'; with a non-motion verb (like "sleep") it means that the action/event took place 'at a distance (from here)'. In 19, the verb *aru* 'to work' must be considered *with its object* to establish whether it is motion or non-motion. With an object like "irrigation ditch" it is a motion verb, and the addition of *-mu* indicates that the work is/was in the direction of the speaker. With an object like "house" it is non-motion (since one does not move along when building a house) and the addition of *-mu* indicates that the house is/was constructed at some distance from the speaker.

- (19) a. [wasi-ta aru]-mu-
 house-ACC work-afar-
- b. [sikya-ta aru]-mu-
 ditch-ACC work-afar-
- a. 'to work (on) a house at some distance'
 b. 'to work an irrigation ditch toward here'

These examples show that the suffix *-mu* must contain both the verb and its object within its scope.

3.4. Switch reference "anomalies"

To understand the main example on which this section is based (example 24), two general facts about Quechua are discussed: First, adverbial clauses are marked as having the same (-r) or different (-pti) subject as the superordinate verb. For example, compare 20 and 21:

- (20) $v_0[R_0[kanta-r_i] \text{ aywa-}n_j]$ (sing-adv(ss) go-3)
 'Singing he goes.' ($i=j$)
- (21) $v_0[R_0[kanta-pti-n_i] \text{ aywa-}n_j]$ (sing-adv(ds)-3 go-3)
 'If/when he_i sings, he_j goes.' ($i \neq j$)

Second, the subjects of intransitive verbs become objects when these are causativized; e.g.:

- (22) a. Aywa-: . (go-1)
 b. Aywa-chi-ma-n. (go-cause- $\Rightarrow$ 1-3)
- a. 'I go.'
 b. 'He makes/allows me to go.'

Let us indicate our awareness that the subject of *aywa*- 'go' ends up as the object of *aywa-chi*- 'cause to go' by leaving a trace in that position:

- (23) $[aywa-\emptyset_i]-chi-ma_i-n$

Now consider 24. From a superficial perspective, it violates the meaning of -r 'same subject' in that since the person who suffers and the one who causes this to persist are different.⁸

- (24) $\tilde{n}aka-r$ qoya:-chi-ma-n.
 suffer-adv(ss) pass:time-cause- $\Rightarrow$ 1-3
- 'He causes me to spend time suffering.'

The apparent anomaly of 24 is not understandable in terms of a surface structure like 25, which implies coreferential relationships as given in 26:

- (25) $v_0[R_0[\tilde{n}aka-r] \text{ } v_0[qoya:-chi-ma:-n]]$
- (26) $v_0[R_0[\tilde{n}aka-r_i] \text{ } v_0[v_1[qoya:-\emptyset_j]-chi-ma:-n_i]]$ ($i \neq j$)

But it is understandable in terms of a surface structure like 27, which implies coreference relationships as given in 28:

- (27) $v_0[v_1[R_0[\tilde{n}aka-r] \text{ } v_1qoya:-] -chi-ma:-n]$

⁸The coreferential interpretation (He suffers in causing me to pass time) is also possible, but definitely not the preferred one.

- (28) $v_0[v_1[r_0[\tilde{n}aka-r_i] \quad qoya:-\emptyset_i]-chi-ma_i-n_j] \quad (i \neq j)$

n̄aka-r and *qoya:-* are joined when the subject of *qoya:-* is first person. Thus the same subject switch-reference marker *-r* is used on *n̄aka-*. By subsequent causativization, this subject is marked as the object.⁹ (Example 29 in footnote.)

Two other examples follow. In example 30, the adverbial clause *utikar* 'when tiring' must be directly subordinate to the clause whose verb is *hama-* 'sit', and not to the main verb:

- (30) Chay silleeta [utika-r hamaku-na:-]-paq ka-ra-n.
 that chair tire-adv(ss) sit-sub-1P-PUR be-past-3

'That chair was for me to sit in when I tired.'

In example 31 the adverbial clause must be associated with the verb *miku-* 'eat' before reciprocalization:

- (31) [Mayqa-nchii-si mas:naw:puntata chaya-r miku]-naku-shun.
 which-12P-indef first arrive-adv(ss) eat -recip-12FUT

'Whichever of us(inclusive) arrives first will eat the other.'
 (literally, 'Whichever of us arrives first, we will eat each other.')

What reciprocally holds between speaker and hearer in example 31 is *eating the other upon condition of being he first to arrive*; it does not mean *if we are the first to arrive, then we will eat each other!*

⁹An alternative formulation which I find quite congenial is in the form of a Montague analysis tree: (29)

3.5. Subject-object marking system

There is an anomaly concerning the morphological marking of subjects and objects in verbs: if the subject is third person, and the object is either second person or first person plural inclusive, then the subject marker is of the same person as the object marker. That is, to indicate $3 \Rightarrow 2$ one uses $-\Rightarrow 2 \dots 2$ and to indicate $3 \Rightarrow 12$ one uses $-\Rightarrow 1 \dots 12$: e.g.¹⁰

- (32) a. *maqa-shu-nki* 'he hits you' ($3 \Rightarrow 2$)
 hit- $\Rightarrow 2-2$
- b. *maqa-ma-ra-nchi* 'he hit us' ($3 \Rightarrow 12$)
 hit- $\Rightarrow 1$ -past-12

As seen in 32b, this anomaly spans the tense marker *-ra* 'past'. Now consider 33, in which--rather than a simple tense marker--the paraphrastic future is used:

- (33) *Taripa -ma -q aywa-nchi.*
 catch:up:to- $\Rightarrow 1$ -sub go -12
- 'He will catch up to us.'

On phonological grounds this is definitely two words. Yet the subject and object marking anomaly spans this word boundary. If this is structurally 34 such an anomaly would be surprising, but as analyzed in 35a it is completely parallel to 35b (corresponding to 32b) in which a simple tense marker occurs between the subject and object marking:

- (34) $[[\text{taripa-ma-q}]_{\text{adv}} [\text{aywa-nchi}]_{\text{verb}}]_{\text{vp}}$

¹⁰To handle this anomaly, Muysken [7] gives the following rule (page 318):

[+obj]	tense	[-obj]		1	2	3
αI		αI	-->	αI		-I
βII		βII		βII		-II

A better formulation of this rule, assuming that *-ma*: is [+I, $\pm II$], is as follows:

[+obj]	tense	[-obj]		1	2	3
αI		αI	is interpreted as			-I
+II		+II				-II

This could also be formulated as an expression rule:

[+obj]	tense	[-obj]		1	2	3
αI		-I	-->			αI
+II		-II				+II

In either case, the rules are simpler than that given by Muysken.

3.6. Agglutinative tendencies

Quechua is a highly agglutinative language, i.e., it demonstrates the effects of a long history of postpositions cliticizing onto the ends of words to form new suffixes. The reason that this sort of change is common ^{in Quechua} is that little restructuring is involved.¹¹ But this is only true on the view of structure presented here. A very clear case of this is *-q tuku-* (-sub pretend-) becoming *-qtuku-* followed by a reanalysis of *ku* to *kU*,¹² yielding *-qtu-kU-*:

(36) ...-q tuku-... --> -qtuku- --> -qtu-kU-
 sub pretend pretend pretend-refl

(37) *maqa-qtu-ka-ma-y* 'Pretend to hit me'.
 hit-pretend-refl $\Rightarrow$ 1-2IMP

Consider what the structure that *aywa-q tuku-n* 'He pretends to go' might have before this collapse.

Two alternatives are 38a and 38b (where in 38b "R0" is an adverbial clause node):

If 38a were the original structure, collapse would involve radical restructuring. But if 38b were the original structure, restructuring is localized to the nodes dominating the morphemes which fuse (as circled).

¹¹ I assume a principle of diachronic change roughly as follows:

The probability of a historical change is inversely proportional to the amount of morpho-syntactic restructuring required by the change.

This is undoubtedly too strong applied to individual changes, since changes involving radical restructuring do occur. But I think it is true of classes of change typical of a language.

¹² That is, when *ku* is reanalyzed it acquires the property of undergoing morphophonemic lowering; thus *-kU* becomes *-ka* before e.g., *-ma-*, e.g. *maqa-qtu-ka-ma-y-chu* 'Pretend to hit me'.

3.7. *ka-* 'be' and object markers

By all accounts, *ka-* 'be' is basically an intransitive verb: it is used in expressions such as the following:

- (39) a. *Wasi-n-chaw ka-ra-n.* 'He was in his house.'
 house-3P-LOC be-past-3
- b. *Hatun ka-nqa.* 'He will be big.'
 big be-3future
- c. *Aywa-q ka-:.* 'I used to go.'
 go-agent be-1

ka- 'be' is also used in the participle+auxiliary construction to express past perfect tense (or a passive); e.g.:

- (40) *Aywa-sha ka-ra-n.*
 go-prtcpl be-past-3
- 'He had gone.'

In this construction, with a second person object and third person subject, the object marker

(-shu '=2') may end up following the auxiliary; e.g.:

- (41) *Maqa-sha ka-shu-nki.*
 hit-prtcpl be-⇒2-2
- 'He had hit you.'
 'You have been hit.'

This restriction has to make reference to the category of the stem to which *-sha* is attached: only if it is transitive can the auxiliary be followed by an object marker. This is natural enough if the structure of the participle + auxiliary construction is as in 42a, exactly parallel to the simple perfect tense given in 42b:

- (42) a. *Maqa-sha ka-shu-nki.*
 hit-prtcpl be-⇒2-2
- 'He had hit you. / You have been hit.'
- b. *Maqa-shka-shu-nki.*
 hit-perf-⇒2-2
- 'He has hit you.'

3.8. Passive is phrasal

Keenan [4] gives convincing arguments (from languages very different from Quechua) that passivization applies to verb phrases, resulting in a verb phrase, rather than applying to one sentence to yield another, or to one verb to yield another.

In Quechua, passives are formed with the suffixes *-ka*: 'passive' (see 43) or *-ra*: 'stative' (see 44) or with the participle + auxiliary construction (see 45):

- (43) [Wasi-n-chaw rika]-ka-ra-n.
house-3P-LOC see-passive-past-3

'He was seen in his house.'

- (44) [Rumi-man wata]-ra:-yka-n.
stone-GOAL tie-state-impfv-3

'It is tied to a boulder.'

- (45) [Wasi-n-chaw rika]-sha ka-ra-n.
house-3P-LOC see-ptcpl be

'He was seen in his house.'

As indicated by the bracketing, in each of these cases the passivizing morphology has within its scope an entire phrase, and the result is another phrase.¹³ That is, passivization, which is a morphological process,¹⁴ must apply to verb phrases, which are syntactic structures.

4. Other Arguments

4.1. Derivational versus inflectional morphology

Anderson [2] argues that inflectional morphology must interact with syntax. He still assumes that there is a word formation component which treats derivational morphology. However, this has merely suppressed the problem from that of distinguishing morphology and syntax to that of

¹³ In the proposal outlined in section 2, passivization applies to V2's to yield V1's.

¹⁴ Passivization is certainly a morphological process in the case of passives formed with *-ka*: and *-ra*:; in the case of passives formed by *-sha ka*-, I would also maintain that it is a morphological (as well as syntactic) process, since it involves the addition of morphological material to what is otherwise not a well-formed word.

distinguishing derivational and inflectional morphology.

It has been suggested that there is no real basis for a distinction between derivational and inflectional morphology. For example, Selkirk [11] (page 7) says.

The terms *inflectional* and *derivational* are meant only to provide a loose classification, for the systems of derivational and inflectional morphology are not strictly disjoint.

Muysken [7] makes this claim for Quechua:

In any case, the two differences [between derivational and inflectional morphology--DJW] are never more than gradual ones, and it is not possible to divide the Quechua suffixes unambiguously into two classes. Rather we find a continuum. (page 308)

...not only are there no formal differences between inflection and derivation in Quechua, which would tend to make a distinction between the two unnatural, but also that it is theoretically and empirically preferable to analyze the object, tense/taxis and person markers in exactly the same way as the derivational suffixed... (page 309)

I agree completely with Muysken on this point.

Now if inflectional morphology must be allowed to interact with syntax, and if there is really no firm difference between inflectional and derivational morphology, then morphology and syntax are not strictly independent, and it would be wrong to assert the autonomy of either.

4.2. "Wrong-way" cliticization

By "wrong-way" cliticization, I mean the phenomenon in which a morpheme which is semantically and/or syntactically bound to one element, occurs phonologically attached to another.¹⁵

Payne [8] discusses a Yagua clitic *-nii*¹⁶ which marks third person singular definite direct objects. Although it is semantically and syntactically bound to the object, this clitic attaches to whatever word precedes the object. For example, in 46 it follows the verb, in 47 the subject, and in 48 an adverb:

¹⁵There is some reason to think that wrong-way cliticization was involved in the development of the English genitive construction, with 's becoming cliticized to the possessor, though at some stage it was an agreement marker on the possessed:

[John [his book]] > [John ['s book]] > [[John's] book]

¹⁶I have simplified considerably the Yagua forms cited here.

- (46) Sa-puuchi-nii Anita.
3sgS-carry-3sgO Anita

'He carries Anita.'
- (47) Sa-puuchu Pauro-nii Anita
3sgS-carry Paul-3sgO Anita

'Paul carries Anita.'
- (48) Ray-a-jastya jaadiy-nii jiy-nuvu
1sgS-irr-defeather first-3sgO 2sgP-kill(noun)

'I will defeather your kill first.'

Wrong-way cliticization supports the claim that morphology and syntax are not distinct by showing that the sequence of morphemes grouped together as a word may have no correlation to the syntax. Indeed, in some cases, the groupings of morphemes into words may be contrary to the semantic and syntactic relationships that these morphemes bear.

4.3. Arguments against the priority of words

In many languages, it seems that words have little psycholinguistic reality. For example, in some isolating languages--notoriously those of South East Asia--the notion of word is both difficult to define and difficult for native speakers of those languages grasp (Thomas[12]). And for a polysynthetic, agglutinative language, Matses¹⁷ Harriet Fields (personal communication) says that teaching writing to Matses speakers has shown that the concept of word is very unintuitive to its speaker: many newly literate Matses speakers write word boundaries in a way that is seemingly inconsistent with any common definition of "word."

Further, there is evidence against the claim that "words" are a unit of real-time processing. Wayne Leman (personal communication) says that in Cheyenne it is not uncommon to hear speakers pronounce some prefixes and then to pause considerably before giving the root and suffixes which complete the word. He also reports that speakers may utter some prefixes, the pause after the root,

¹⁷ Matses is a Panoan language spoken in eastern Peru.

correct the root *without repeating the prefixes* and then complete the word.

This is not to say that the concept of word has no place Cheyenne, Matsigenka or the languages of South East Asia. but only that "word" may have little psycho-linguistic reality, little processing significance, and thus probably little or no morpho-syntactic consequences.

5. Conclusions and Consequences

Arguments based on data from Huallaga (Huanuco) Quechua has been given in support of the claim that morphology and syntax are not distinct. These are based on diverse types of evidence, including the following:

- agreement,
- the scope of a case markers.
- verbal suffixes with must have an object within their scope to be correctly interpreted.
- switch reference anomalies.
- the subject-object marking system, and
- diachronic facts.
- object markers with *ka-* 'be'. and
- passives.

Arguments from other languages are also mentioned.

There are important consequences of this view: First, there is a single, unified domain called *morpho-syntax*. Within this domain, **morphemes** rather ^{than} **words** should be taken as basic. The analyst should be concerned with strings of **morphemes** rather than strings of **words**, at least until there is good reason to believe that--for the language in question--the issues of word formation and those of the combination of words into larger units can be dealt with independently. And word boundaries and morpheme boundaries should not be distinguished, particularly as guiding syntactic analysis.

Lexical and phrasal categories should not be distinguished: these differ simply in that phrasal categories may be instantiated by more than one word, whereas lexical categories may not, and this

difference is unlikely to be syntactically significant.¹⁸ Giving status for morpho-syntactic analysis to this difference is likely to lead the analysis astray.

I suspect that, if the morpho-syntax of a wide range of languages were to be investigated from a perspective free of a bias toward words, a view of grammar would emerge in which it was clearly seen that morphology and syntax cannot adequately be dealt with one apart from the other.

Bibliography

- [1] Abraham, Winter (editor).
Valence, Semantic Case, and Grammatical Relations.
John Benjamins B. V., Amsterdam. 1978.
Valence and Semantic Case Working Group".
- [2] Anderson, S.
Where's Morphology.
Linguistic Inquiry 13(4):571-612, Fall. 1982.
- [3] Aronoff, M.
Linguistic Inquiry Monograph. Volume 1: Word Formation in Generative Grammar.
MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1976.
- [4] Keenan, E.
Passive is Phrasal (not Sentential or Lexical).
In Hoekstra, T., H. Van der Hulst, and M. Moortgat (editors). *Glott-Lexical Grammar*, pages
181-213. Foris Publications, Dordrecht, 1980.
- [5] Kramsky, J.
The Word as a Linguistic Unit.
Mouton, The Hague. 1969.
- [6] Matthews, P. H.
Morphology. An Introduction to the Theory of Word-Structure.
Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. 1974.
- [7] Muysken, P.
Quechua Word Structure.
In Frank Heny (editor), *Binding and Filtering*. chapter 8 pages 279-325. Croom Helm, London,
1981.
- [8] Payne, T.
Definite Direct Object Marking: Another Possible Source of Ergativity.
January, 1983.
manuscript.
- [9] Pike, K.
A Problem in Morphology-Syntax Division.
Acta Linguistica Hafniensia 5:125-36, 1949.
- [10] Sadock, J.
Noun Incorporation in Greenlandic.
Language 56(2):300-19, 1980.
- [11] Selkirk, E.
Linguistic Inquiry Monograph. Volume 7: The Syntax of Words.
MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1982.

- [12] Thomas, D.
How Intuitive is the Word?
Notes on Linguistics (13), 1980.
- [13] Weber, D.
Suffix-as-Operator Analysis and the Grammar of Successive Encoding in Llacón (Huánuco) Quechua.
Documento de Trabajo 13, Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, Yarinacocha. Perú, 1976.
- [14] Weber, D.
UC Publications in Linguistics. Volume forthcoming: *Relativization and Nominalized Clauses in Huallaga (Huánuco) Quechua*.
University of California Press. Berkeley, California, 1983.
- [15] Weber, D.
A Grammar of Huallaga (Huanuco) Quechua.
PhD thesis, UCLA, May. 1983.
available from University Microfilms International.