

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910826777503321
Titolo	Morphosyntactic categories and the expression of possession [[electronic resource] /] / edited by Kersti Borjars, David Denison, Alan Scott
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Amsterdam ; ; Philadelphia, : John Benjamins Pub. Co., 2012
ISBN	1-283-97084-8 90-272-7300-6
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (353 p.)
Collana	Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, , 0166-0829 ; ; v. 199
Altri autori (Persone)	BorjarsKersti DenisonDavid <1950-> ScottAlan (Alan K.)
Disciplina	415
Soggetti	Grammar, Comparative and general - Possessives Grammar, Comparative and general - Morphosyntax
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references and index.
Nota di contenuto	Morphosyntactic Categories and the Expression of Possession; Editorial page; Title page; LCC data; Table of contents; Introduction*; Dealing with postmodified possessors in early English; 1.1 Introduction; 1.1.1 The corpora; 1.2 Old English; 1.2.1 Split genitives in Old English; 1.2.1.1 Extraposed material in the genitive case; 1.2.1.2 Extraposed prepositional phrases; 1.2.1.3 Extraposed relative clauses; 1.2.1.4 Summary of split genitives in Old English; 1.3 The beginnings of the group genitive; 1.3.1 Changes in Middle English; 1.3.2 Separated genitives 1.4 Split and group genitives in Middle and Early Modern English 1.4.1 Split genitives with prepositions; 1.4.2 Group genitives; 1.4.3 Marking; 1.4.3.1 Split genitives; 1.4.3.2 Group genitives; 1.4.3.3 Possessive phrases without heads; 1.4.4 Marking: Summary; 1.5 Split vs. group; 1.5.1 Prepositions and thematic roles; 1.5.2 Complexity of the possessor phrase; 1.6 Conclusion; Variation in the form and function of the possessive morpheme in Late Middle and Early Modern English; 2.1 Introduction; 2.2 The material; 2.3 Typical use of the possessive construction; 2.4 Morpho-syntactic structures

2.5 Possessor types 2.6 The possessive morpheme marker; 2.7 Placement of the possessive morpheme; 2.8 Conclusion; appendices; appendix a.; appendix b: sources; LETTERS; Letter collections used;; HISTORY; SERMONS; The great regression; 3.1 Introduction; 3.2 The history of genitive variation in English: an overview; 3.3 Data; 3.4 The variable context; 3.5 Genitive frequencies over time: An overview; 3.6 Conditioning factors; 3.6.1 Semantics: Genitive relation; 3.6.2 Semantics: Possessor animacy; 3.6.3 Processing: Possessor length and possessum length 3.6.5 Information status: Possessor givenness 3.6.6 Text linguistics: Possessor thematicity; 3.6.7 Text linguistics: Lexical density; 3.6.8 Language-internal conditioning factors: Interim summary; 3.7 Environmental factors: On the impact of changing input frequencies; 3.7.1 Model fitting and model simplification; 3.7.2 Model evaluation and model discussion; 3.7.3 Environmental factors: Interim summary; 3.8 Changing genitive grammars; 3.8.1 Model fitting and model simplification; 3.8.2 Model evaluation and model discussion; 3.8.3 Changing genitive grammars: Interim summary 3.9 Discussion and conclusion Nominal categories and the expression of possession; 4.1 Introduction; 4.2 The broader context; 4.3 A corpus study of the English possessive alternation; 4.3.1 What factors drive the alternation?; 4.3.2 Finding the envelope of variation; 4.3.3 What should be excluded?; 4.3.4 How were examples coded?; 4.3.4.1 Weight; 4.3.4.2 Animacy; 4.3.4.3 Discourse status; 4.3.5 Initial results and a confound; 4.3.5.1 Initial results; 4.3.5.2 A conundrum regarding the confound; 4.3.5.3 Interpreting regression results; 4.4 The Monolexemic possessor construction 4.4.1 The grammaticalization of optimal weight

Sommario/riassunto

In this paper we compare two ways of expressing possession in the Indo-Aryan language Urdu. While the genitive case marker can be analyzed as a clitic in a relatively straightforward way, the *ezafe* construction poses a challenge when it comes to its classification as either a phrasal affix or clitic. Samvelian (2007) analyzes Persian *ezafe* as a phrasal affix that is generated within the morphological component, rejecting a postlexical analysis. After taking a look at the data for both constructions, we challenge Samvelian's view of *ezafe* and explore the possibilities for
