# Inflectional periphrasis as collocation

Recent years have seen a growing recognition that inflectional periphrases should not be seen as free syntactic combinations but as the realization of cells in the inflectional paradigms of lexemes. This analytic mode of exponence stands in potential competition with synthetic means of morphological exponence, (a.o. Ackerman and Webelhuth (1998), Sadler and Spencer (2001), Ackerman and Stump (2004)).

An adequate theory of periphrasis should meet the following design properties: **1.** The definition of periphrasis should be independent of phrase structure: the (two or more) syntactic exponents may stand in various phrase-structural relations, depending on the language, and even within the same language. **2.** The syntactic exponents stand in a head-argument or head-modifier relation. The locality of this relation can be disrupted only as far as the grammar of the language allows for such disruptions in general (e.g. by extraction or coordination). **3.** Gaps in the morphological paradigms of auxiliaries should not be stipulated in their lexical entries. **4.** The morphological component should be realizational rather than incremental. **5.** Arbitration between synthetic and periphrastic realization should be done within the morphological component, because it follows the logic of Panini's Principle.

We argue that none of the extant proposals in the 'Periphrasis as syntactic exponence' tradition meets these criteria. Ackerman and Webelhuth (1998) is too constrained to meet criteria **1** and **2**, while on the contrary Sadler and Spencer (2001) or Ackerman and Stump (2004) are not constrained enough. Bonami and Samvelian (2009) and Bonami and Webelhuth (to appear) are two recent attempts to address these issues by treating periphrasis as a special case of syntactic government; however the former does not meet criterion **4**, while the latter does not meet criteria **3** and **5**. In addition, neither approach can deal with periphrases that employ the modifier-head relation, such as English periphrastic comparatives.

In our talk, we argue that all of the desiderata above can be met in a grammar design where inflection rules classically map lexemes into single words. However, like words in general (e.g. *cut* in *cut the red tape*), inflected words can carry collocational requirements and these requirements may be contributed by a clause of the paradigm function that is applied in the mapping from lexeme to inflected word. Specifically, we argue that in a periphrase, the inflection rules generate the main element as an inflected word but provide it with a collocational requirement that makes it reverse-select for the auxiliary element. The auxiliary element is then constrained to be a head or modifier selecting the main element or one of its phrase projections. The desiderata listed above are met by this approach: **1.** Periphrastic collocational requirements for selecting heads and modifiers alike are possible, as these elements are possible collocational targets outside of the realm of inflectional exponence (see the modifier *red* in *cut the red tape*). **2.** As collocational requirements act as wellformedness conditions on the head-argument or head-modifier relations involving the word carrying the collocational requirement, the locality of these relations may be disrupted only as far as the grammar of the language allows this. **3.** Auxiliaries involved in a periphrasis will have all and only those word forms required for them to serve the function as syntactic exponents of the paradigm they contribute to realizing periphrastically. **4.** The morphological component is fully realizational. **5.** Arbitration between synthetic and periphrastic realization is done completely within the morphological component.

In the talk, we will present a formal model of the theory based on a combination of HPSG (Pollard and Sag, 1994) and PFM (Stump, 2001) and a variant of the theory of collocations of Sailer (2000). We will apply it in detail to representative cases of periphrasis to demonstrate its analytical viability.

References

Ackerman, F. and Stump, G. T. (2004). 'Paradigms and periphrastic expression: A study in realization- based lexicalism'. In L. Sadler and A. Spencer (eds.), *Projecting Morphology.* Stanford: CSLI Publications, 111–157.

Ackerman, F. and Webelhuth, G. (1998). *A Theory of Predicates.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Bonami, O. and Samvelian, P. (2009). 'Inflectional periphrasis in Persian'. In S. Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the HPSG 2009 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 26–46.

Bonami, O. and Webelhuth, G. (to appear). 'The phrase-structural diversity of periphrasis: a lexicalist account'. To appear in M. Chumakina and G. Corbett (eds.) *Periphrasis.* Oxford: British Academy and Oxford University Press.

Pollard, C. and Sag, I. (1994) *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sadler, L. and Spencer, A. (2001). 'Syntax as an exponent of morphological features'. In G. Booij and J. van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 2000*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 71–96.

Sailer, M. (2000). *Combinatorial Semantics and Idiomatic Expressions in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Tübingen. Appeared as Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340, Nr. 161. Universität Stuttgart and Universität Tübingen, 2003

Stump, G. T. (2001). *Inflectional Morphology: A Theory of Paradigm Structure.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.