How verbs are placeheld/placeh

Nino Amiridze (Tbilisi State University) & Steven Foley (University of So

Big Questions for theory, acquisition, and processing of morphology

How is **wordbuilding** constrained by locality?

• Form-meaning dependencies among predicates & arguments, roots & functional structure

What factors guide morphological innovation?

- Reanalysis from phrase to lexeme, changing an anaphor's category
- Analytical/structural ambiguity and dialect variation

How do we understand **acceptability judgements** of complex morphology?

 A linking theory that connects formal representations, morphological processing, and rating tasks

The special morphosyntax of placeholder verbs offers many Puzzles

Ordinary Georgian verbs have four structural positions

(2)

(1) $ga = va - gd - et^h$ PART= 1TR- throw -PST.PL "We threw them out"

		Voice		
PartP	V ⁰			
1	$\mathbf{\hat{l}}$	↓ _		
PART=	stem	AGR-		

Placeholder verbs (**PHV**s) have exceptional morphology

- They combine the **demonstrative "that"** with the **light verb "do"** (3)
- Stand-ins for regular verbs (euphemism, tip-of-the-tongue states)
- Adding a **particle** introduces **more agreement** possibilities (4a-c)
- (3) **PHV without Particle** imas-**v**-k^hen-it^h DEM-**1AGR**-do-PST.PL 'We thatdid them." [i.e., we threw them out]

Just the tip of the

- (4) PHV with Particle
 - a. ? ga=imas-**v**-k^hen-it^h PART=DEM-**1AGR**-do-PST.PL
 - b. ?? ga=v-imas-k^hen-it^h PART=**1**AGR-DEM-dO-PST.PL
 - c. ? $ga=v-imas-v-k^{h}en-it^{h}$ PART=**1**AGR-DEM-**1**AGR-do-PST.PL
 - All: "We thatdid [i.e., threw] them out."

PHVs involve reanalyzed argument structure

- (5) k'ats^h-s is v-u-k^henit^h (6)1agr-310-do:INFL man-dat dem.nom "We did that [_{IndObi} to the man]"
- (7) k'ats^h-i (ga=)imas-v-k^henit^h (8) man-NOM (PART=)DEM-1AGR-dO:INFL "We thatdid [_{DirObi} **the man**] (out)"



INFL

Voice⁰ Appl⁰ **Voice**⁰

Hyp1: "That'

PHVs rese typical X⁰

- (9) simart truth:NOM "We cla
- If compo

(11) underst

Hyp2: "That

Georgian

Closed cl

- (12) mo=vi-PART=1RE "We wo

*Hyp3: "*That"

One type

VoiceP co

(14) [_{TP} [_{VoiceP} LTP LVOICEP "We we

The PHV

Semantical

olded in Georgian Southern California) • Penn Locality Workshop (3/31/2	3)	Contact: foleys@usc.ec Info: stevenrfoley.gith Thanks especially to RA Baramidze, Tamar Kalkh Natia Poniava, and Irak
combines with "do", forming a novel Compound Verb emble archaic X^0 +IV ⁰ compounds (9) more than	Amo	rphological Accep
+Y ⁰ compounds (10) e [ts ^h ad- v -q'av]-it ^h (10) v -[gulis-χm]-obt ^h [clear-1AGR-LightVerb]-PST.PL 1AGR-[heart:GEN-voice]-NPST.PL 'iffied the truth" "We have it in mind" unds, do PHVs inherit irregularities from "do"? bood ~ *understanded vs. grandstanded ~ *grandstood the particle in a novel Particle Verb Construction particles: lexical, directional, aspectual		 LXPERIMENT deta 1–5 Likert judgement PHV relative to a lexic Nine 2×2 substudies (items) run as co-fillers 65 participants took p 1 or 2 sessions online Substudy 1: Base PHVs without particles
lass of P ⁰ -like elements – is "that" reanalyzed as one? -g-et ^h vs. $ts'a=va-g-et^h$ E-ROOT-PST.PL PART=1TR-ROOT-PST.PL on" "We lost" NP_{obj} PartP Voice ⁰	PAR PAR PT=AG Sub	T=DEM-AGR T=AGR-DEM R-DEM-AGR R-DEM-AGR 0.00 0.25 Rating 1 (wors
is part of a novel Suspended Affixation construction e of V°+V° compound involves truncation	• Irre • Per	egular stem vs. Defa nalty for default, wo
<pre>bordination that preserves prefixes but suspends suffixes bordination that preserves prefixes but supplies bordination that preserves prefixes but supplite bordination</pre>	$PT = \mathbf{D}$ $PT = \mathbf{A}$ $PT = \mathbf{A}$ $PT = \mathbf{A}$	em-Agr-Irreg GR-DEM-Irreg DEM-Agr-Dftt AGR-DEM-Dftt 0.00 0.25 Rating 1 (wors
VoiceP VoiceP PartP V ⁰ Voice ⁰ V ⁰ Voice ⁰ -INFL AGR- DEM	Theor Dire • Va • Me	ections for future riation: do ratings eaning: semantics
W construction has truly Sui Generis morphological properties ght not be reanalyzed as any extant structure $= (aa=)imas-v-k^{h}en-it^{h}en$	lex Pos • Ge	emes & root allo sible follow up orgian: How hard
$D_1 / (gu / (u) v (u) u)$		

Hyp4: The Pl

PHVs mic

(16) $\left[\left[_{VP} PHV^{0}\right] Voice^{0}\right] T^{0}\right] \longrightarrow$



- $\xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}_2}$ ga=v-imas-k^hen-it^h
 - ga=v-imas-v-k^hen-it^h



s are best. Particle + Outer Agr is worst of all.



ault stem (cf. placeheld~placeholded; thatdid~thatdoed)

orse with outer agr – **structural or linear locality**?



gical **Next Steps**

ure theoretical work

gs cluster into coherent dialect groups?

s of deixis & event anaphora, complex semy; pragmatics of placeholding

p studies

d is it to identify inflectional errors in PHVs, ordinary verbs (1), and archaic (9) or truncated (14) compounds?

• English: How good are compound verbs differing in X^0-V^0 **compositionality?** (basketweaved~basketwove, proofread~proofreaded)