In §3.2, we showed that conceiving of periphrasis as a type of inflectional exponence makes it possible to resolve two long-standing problems in the analysis of compound tenses: it accounts for the fact that synthetic expressions of tense participate in blocking relations with periphrastic expressions (as when the principal part specifications in (24) override the implicative rule in Table 5), and does so without recourse to any ad hoc principle of morphological blocking; and it accounts for the fact that a compound tense’s morphosyntactic properties are often not the compositional combination of the morphosyntactic properties of its parts. In the present section, we have extended this morphological conception of periphrasis into the domain of lexeme derivation: by regarding periphrasis as one of the possible marks of lexeme derivation, we can now maintain a lexicalist theory of grammar that is fully compatible with the principle of lexical modification. In a theory of this sort, a phrasal predicate’s f-structure is not determined by the postulation of co-heads, nor by predicate composition in constituent structure, nor by argument merger, but is instead directly determined by the lexicon: for instance, the f-structural contrast between the intransitive predicate *meg hal ‘die’* in (52a) and the transitive predicate *bele hal ‘die from X’* in (52b) is directly determined by the entries of the lexemes ⟨MEG, HAL⟩ and ⟨BELE, HAL⟩, whose relatedness is mediated by a rule of lexeme derivation that is not distinct in character from the rule of derivation by which the synthetically expressed lexemes OLVAS ‘read’ and ⟨OLVAS, causative⟩ are related.

5 Conclusions

In this chapter we have presented a wide array of empirical data from a domain widely represented across languages, namely that of periphrastic predicates (including compound tense constructions in the inflectional domain and phrasal verb constructions in the domain of derivation and compounding). We have identified certain challenges which these periphrastic predicates raise for the sorts of lexicalist proposals presented in this book. In recognition of these challenges we have outlined an alternative lexicalist proposal and shown, in schematic fashion, how this conception of lexicalism can provide a treatment for compound tense constructions which can be naturally extended to account for phrasal verb constructions as well. This alternative focuses on the distinction between the grammatical word as manifest in content paradigms and its surface realization as represented in form paradigms. Throughout we have formulated our analyses in terms of realization rules responsible for constructing surface word forms. However, there is another dimension of this sort of morphological approach that we have neglected, namely, the patterns of relatedness among surface word forms themselves that become evident when words are interpreted as being parts of paradigms: that is, this type of proposal naturally leads to a conception of morphology in which surface word forms and the patterns they participate in, i.e., the system of cells they occupy in paradigms, are as worthy theoretical objects as the rules that construct each separate (class of) word form. This dimension of analysis is presently the focus of recent research by (Ackerman & Blevins 2006, Ackerman & Malouf 2006, Finkel & Stump 2006a, 2006b, Blevins 2005, 2006, among others.) Acknowledging that there are directions that cannot be discussed here, we hope that the phenomena presented and the proposals which we have
developed for them will provoke what appears to be a necessary reconceptualization of certain commonly-held lexicalist assumptions concerning the nature of morphology and its consequences for viable views about the interaction between the lexicon, morphology, and syntactic expression.
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