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**Overview**

The overall goal of this course is to offer an in depth investigation of word structure. In sharp contrast to lexicalism, recent syntactic approaches to word formation, e.g., work couched within the framework of Distributed Morphology (DM), but also Borer (2005, 2013) and Svenonius (2012) hold that words are internally syntactically complex. We will discuss in detail the merits of this proposal by contrasting lexicalist and syntactic approaches to word formation as well as discussing differences among the aforementioned syntactic approaches to word formation.

**Course description**

There will be three lectures.

**1. How many places for word formation?** In this lecture,we will discuss and evaluate the following three approaches to word formation: a) All operations of word formation take place in the lexicon (Lapointe 1979, Lieber 1980 and subsequent work, Williams 1981, Kiparsky 1982 and subsequent work). b) All operations of word formation take place in the syntax, e.g. Distributed Morphology (DM) (e.g. Embick & Marantz 2008, Embick 2010.). c) There is more than one place for word formation, i.e. certain derivational operations take place in the lexicon, others in the syntax (e.g. Wasow 1977, Reinhart & Siloni 2005) or the view that derivation is different from inflection; derivation takes place in the syntax, while inflection takes place after syntax (e.g. Borer 2005).

**2. DM and other exoskeletal approaches.** In this lecture, we will discuss three recent syntactic approaches to word formation, namely work couched within DM, Borer (2013), and Svenonius (2012). While they all assume that words are internally complex, the three frameworks differ significantly. For instance, for Borer, the presence of structural complexity is correlated with the presence of overt morphological material, e.g. nominals structures realized with –*ation* are considered complex as opposed to the absence of such complexity in e.g. [N jump]. Span based word formation allows for a unique lexical item to spell out a complex syntactic structure. By contrast, DM recognizes that some functional heads can have zero realizations.

**3. Root suppletion**. An important feature of DM is the idea that the syntax puts together abstract feature bundles, which are only provided with phonological exponence postsyntactically (Late Insertion). During this process, a series of VIs relating phonological information with morphosyntactic features compete for insertion into terminal nodes of the morphosyntactic structure. The term 'Late Insertion' refers precisely to the fact that insertion of phonological exponents follows all syntactic operations. What is currently a matter of debate is the issue of whether late insertion applies to functional morphemes only or to both roots and functional morphemes. Root suppletion and the status of readjustment rules are in the center of this debate. In this lecture, we will discuss the arguments in favor and against root suppletion.

**Prerequisites**

Students should be familiar with syntactic theory and basic concepts of morphology.
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