

## ISSUES OF SCOPE FOR NON- $C_A$ AND NON- $V_X C_S$ -BASED MORPHOLOGY IN A FORMATIVE

I've been working on establishing the first set of lexical roots in the new language and their associated  $-V_X C_S$  affixes. These are the roots associated with translative motion (e.g., 'go/come, arc-like trajectory, ascend/decend, etc.), spatial position/orientation/direction (e.g., above, below, ahead, behind, left, right, center), and spatially-defined componential parts (e.g., the front, the rear, the side, the top, the bottom, the upper half, the lower half, etc.).

As detailed in a previous posts, such roots will now have associated  $V_X C_S$  affixes that will allow one to craft a detailed "moving image" of a sequential path, in order to emulate English sentences such as '*Come on down up along through to the back.*'

I will be soon be posting a PDF detailing these new roots and suffixes, along with various other new suffixes. However, in experimenting with these new roots, I've stumbled across a problem as described below.

As an experiment driven by curiosity, I decided to utilize a few of these new roots and suffixes to create the first formative in the new language. Throwing caution to the wind, I decided that the formative would be "fully inflected", i.e., all fourteen slots would be filled. Below is what I've come up with. The first row is the slot numbers, the second row is the actual phonological manifestation of each morpheme, the third row identifies the morpheme, and the fourth row gives a "thumbnail" semantic interpretation of the morpheme:

I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV
<b>h</b>	<b>ae</b>	<b>'n</b>	<b>woŋ</b>	<b>oa</b>	<b>kr</b>	<b>öa</b>	<b>ln</b>	<b>au</b>	<b>'</b>	<b>l</b>	<b>ömky</b>	<b>uö</b>	[ultimate]
CPT version	POT illocution	Effect: 1m/BEN	new $V_X C_S$ affix (preceded by required <b>w-</b> )	CUL Aspect	Root:	INT Specification; DYN Function; Stem 2	SUB Mood	PRI Valence	FRM Designation	M / DEL / CSL / UNI / NRM	new $V_X C_S$ affix: planar circular motion perpendicular ar to main vector path	CTR Case	FNC Context
(see Slot VII)	'wish/hope'	'of benefit to speaker'	'entry from outside to the center of something'	'some day (to come)', 'eventually'	'ascend at oblique angle'	'achieve the purpose of'	'might'	'take part in'	[elevates root's meaning to being dedicated 'travel' or 'journey']	[default CA values]	'with corkscrew-like trajectory'	'instead of'	[event has socially-defined reason or purpose] 'officially'

So how do we translate this formative? Here's where we encounter the problem. We've had numerous discussions on the sub-reddit as to ways of delineating the scope of the  $C_A$  complex as well as  $-V_X C_S$  affixes, leading to solutions involving new  $V_X$  types for these affixes. But, in examining the above word, it seems we will also need scoping mechanisms for categories such as Illocution, Case, Aspect, and Valence. Without such scoping mechanisms, all of the following become possible translations of the above:

POSSIBLE TRANSLATIONS OF *hae'woŋoakröalnau'lömküö* :

TRANSLATION 1: '*...instead of hoping that one day I might benefit by officially taking part in entering and traveling upward in a corkscrew-like trajectory to reach the very center*'

TRANSLATION 2: '*...instead of benefiting from hoping to take part some day in officially entering and traveling upward in a corkscrew-like trajectory to reach the very center*'

TRANSLATION 3: '*... hoping to maybe one day benefit by instead taking part in entering and traveling upward in a corkscrew-like trajectory to officially reach the very center*'

I'm sure other translations are possible.

At any rate, it seems to me the easiest and most-straightforward way to specify the scope of these categories (so such phrases have one translation rather than several) is to simply establish an overt hierarchy of scope for the various categories (rather than allow options/exceptions which would require new affixes, alternate forms of infixes, etc.).

The question then becomes: *what hierarchical pattern makes the most sense?* Should Illocution encapsulate Effect or vice-versa? Should they both be encapsulated by Case or should Case be the first category to be applied after the  $C_A$  complex and Type 2/4  $V_X C_S$  suffixes? Etc., etc., etc.

### **Then again . . .**

Now that I think of it, there's another possible approach to the problem. If we **DON'T** establish a hierarchy of scope, this would likely discourage the creation of such "fully inflected" formatives, due to the very fact that they start to become ambiguous. So that instead of trying to "pack" a single formative with as many morphemes as possible, the speaker would instead express the thought in several words, each of which is simpler (i.e., has fewer non-default morphemes), each word juxtaposed in a more natural-language style of syntax where the scope of each morpheme is clear.

I can certainly understand idealistic criticism to such an approach in that it "defeats one of the purposes" of an Ithkuilic language by discouraging morpho-lexical conciseness, but let's get real for a moment: *you guys actually want to learn and use this language.* Do any of you really believe you will eventually reach fluency in this language to the point where you are able to mentally craft words like *hae'nwofoakröalnau'lömkyuô* on the fly? If you do, my hat is off to you and your 200+ I.Q., but my guess is that such fluency is beyond human ability. Therefore, such a word should be confined to written and poetic contexts for rhetorical and artistic purposes. For us mere mortals, a three or four word phrase (probably containing only a few more total syllables than the single word version) will be sufficiently manageable.

Anyway, I let you all discuss it and decide which way we should go.

--John Q.