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INTRODUCTION
In dealing with the morphology-syntax interface, there are four main thematic areas to look at in order to understand how these two linguistic domains interface.

We shall observe;

1. The demarcation of the empirical domain of morphology and syntax:
   - When is a multimorphemic sequence a word, and when is it a phrase?
2. Morphology and syntax interact in two ways:

• Syntactic constructs may form parts of a complex word, and

• Syntax in its turn governs the use of morphological case marking on words.

3. How morphological operations may affect the syntactic valency of words.
4. Languages may have syntactic alternatives to the morphological expression of grammatical and semantic content, and we might therefore want to know more about the division of labour between morphology and syntax in this respect.
WORDS AND PHRASES
Morphology deals primarily with the structure of words, and syntax with the structure of phrases. But how do you know if a particular combination of morphemes is a word or a phrase?

Is the lexical unit *hard disk* a word (that is, compound of the type A + N), or a noun phrase? How can we know?
The most important criterion for wordhood is *Lexical Integrity*.

Lexical Integrity:

‘The syntax neither manipulates nor has access to the internal form of words’

Let’s take the English compound *teapot*

- It is impossible to take out one component and topicalize it:
  - *Tea, I bought pots.*
  - *Teapots, I bought.*

- Anaphoric devices cannot refer to parts of the compound:
  - *He took the *tea* pot and poured it into the cup.*
A) Lexical Integrity implies that if we call something a word, syntactic rules cannot apply to its integral parts.

The importance of this criterion can be illustrated by looking at the difference between prefixed verbs and particle verbs in Dutch.
Dutch has a syntactic rule of Verb Second which requires finite verbal forms in main clauses to appear in second position, after the first constituent.

However, the underlying word order in Dutch is SOV (Subject-Object-Verb). This means that in the surface form, the verb moves.
If the verb is prefixed, the prefix moves along with the stem, which shows that the prefix is not a separate word.

On the other hand, if the verb is a particle verb (that is a phrasal verb), when the main verb moves, the particle is stranded in the original position of the V.
This shows that particles are words on their own.

Hence, we get the following contrast for the Dutch

- prefixed verb *doorzóeken* “to search”
- particle verb *dóorzoekken* “to continue searching”
a. Jan door-zocht het hele gebouw
John through-seek. PAST. SG the whole building
“John searched the whole building”

b. Jan zocht tot 2 uur door
John seek. PAST. SG till 2 o’clock through
“John continued searching till 2 o’clock”
The difference between prefixed verbs and particle verbs is reflected by the difference in the location of the main stress of these expressions: *doorzóeeken & dóorzoeeken*

Particles bear main stress, whereas in prefixed verbs it is the verbal stem that carries main stress.
B) Lexical integrity also implies that English verb particle constructions such as *to look up* are to be considered phrasal verbs because the two parts can be separated:

- *John looked up the information.*
- *John looked the information up.*

Essentially, since syntax rules can break it up, it violates *lexical integrity* and is thus a phrase.
C) Lexical Integrity manifests itself in the fact that syntactically governed rules of inflection do not apply to the individual parts of a word.

Dutch:

- Ròd-eₐ ko’olₐ “red cabbage”
- This expression is a phrase because;
  1. the adjective is inflected -e, as is the rule in Dutch for prenominal adjectives.
  2. the main stress is on the second constituent kóol
• Zu’ur_{akòol}N “lit. sour cabbage, sauerkraut”

• This expression is a compound word because:
  1. The adjective is not inflected
  2. The first constituent bears the main stress, as is the rule for Dutch nominal compounds

❖ In English, a compound word is distinguished from a phrase using *stress*

• **Compound word**: main stress is on the first constituent. e.g. ‘*greenhouse*

• **Phrase**: main stress is on the second constituent. e.g. *green ‘house*

**WORDS AND PHRASES**
D) The extent to which Rules of Anaphora are subject to the Lexical Integrity constraint is a debate.

When it comes to Anaphora, Lexical Integrity constraint is seemingly limited. Let’s take the following examples:

a) John likes [the guitar] because he thinks it is a social instrument.
b) John became a **guitarist** because he thought *it* was a social instrument.

- In (a), *[guitar]* is co-indexed with *‘it’*, meaning they refer to the same entity. The pronoun *‘it’* is interpreted as *‘guitar’*.

- In (b), the pronoun *‘it’* is also interpreted as *‘guitar’*. 
However, we see ‘guitarist’ and not ‘guitar’ in (b). This would imply a co-indexation of the nature:
• John became a [guitar]-ist because he thought it was a social instrument.

If so, the Lexical Integrity constraint does not hold for rules of anaphora.

This however goes against the general observation that words, when embedded in complex words, lose their referential potential.
Rather, sentence (b) can be accounted for like this:

- The pronoun ‘it’ receives an interpretation within the domain of discourse evoked by this sentence.

- The word ‘guitarist’ evokes the entity ‘guitar’, which is an entity in the discourse domain, and thus becomes the referent or interpretation of ‘it’
To demarcate between morphology and syntax, there is the need for a formal criteria. This is not exactly straightforward.

Take for instance the expression ‘*yellow fever*’

Semantically, it is a lexical unit and is stored in the English lexicon as such.
Morphologically, it is not really a word. Its stress pattern is that of a phrase with the main stress on the head word: yellow ‘fever.

Sometimes there is no clear demarcation between syntax and morphology.
Is there a NO PHRASE CONSTRAINT on complex words?

• Answer: NO

• Phrases do occur as part of complex words.
Look at these examples of complex words from English:

- \[\text{special exhibitions}\] gallery
- \[\text{module for module}\] upgrade
- \[\text{drugs and rehabilitation}\] centre

The words in square brackets comprise phrases.

In the first example, \[\text{special exhibitions}\] is a phrase of the type A+N with the main stress on the second constituent.
However, not every phrase can contribute to word formation.

For example, English phrases that have determiners cannot be part of complex words.

*the [[the special exhibitions] gallery]
• This ungrammaticality has to do with the fact that [the special exhibitions] with the definite determiner is a referring expression, whereas word constituents in non-head position have a modifying, classificatory function.

❖ Affixation of phrases is possible, but it is limited to highly productive affixes such as:
• The English nominalizing suffix -er
  - E.g. *do good-er*, *fast track-er*, *do-it-yourself-er*

• The Dutch equivalent -er
  - E.g. *vierde klass-er*  “fourth grader”

• The Dutch diminutive suffix -(t)je
  - E.g. *twaalfuur-tje*
  “lit. twelve o’clock-DIM; lunch food”
From the above discussion we see how morphology is demarcated from syntax.

However:

• Syntax can feed word formation.

• Morphology also feeds syntax by supplying the units to be operated on by syntactic rules.
GRAMMATICAL FUNCTIONS AND CASE MARKINGS
In most languages, the interface between the semantic properties of a clause and its morphosyntactic structure (word order, case marking) is partially regulated by the grammatical function frame of the verb of that clause.

For instance, the English verb **HIT** denotes an action with two participants: the one who hits, and what/who is hit.
We refer to these crucially involved entities as **core arguments** of the predicate ‘hit’

The Predicate Argument Structure (PAS) of this verb can be represented as **Hit x,y**

- E.g. Kofi hit Ama.

PAS refers to the number and type of participants/arguments a predicate requires.
This relationship between the PAS of a verb and its syntactic realization can be expressed by linking the grammatical functions ‘subject’ (SUBJ) and ‘object’ (OBJ) to the arguments of PAS.

\[
\text{HIT, } X_{\text{AGENT}}, y_{\text{PATIENT}} \quad \text{Predicate Argument Structure}
\]

\[
\text{SUBJ} \quad \text{OBJ} \quad \text{Grammatical Function Frame}
\]
The two arguments of *to hit* are the core arguments that always have to be expressed.

The number of arguments a verb requires to be expressed is referred to as its *syntactic valency*.

In addition to the core arguments, there might be other entities involved in specifying the event of *'hitting'* such as the *instrument* and the *location*.
• e.g. *John* hit *his enemy* in the back *with a stick*.

❖ These latter specifications are always *optional*, and such participants in the event are usually called *adjuncts*.

❖ The relationship between the two levels of PAS and grammatical functions is often predictable by *linking rules*. 
If there are two arguments, then the argument that expresses the *Agent* of the action will be expressed as the *grammatical subject*, and the other argument as the *grammatical object*.

If there is only one argument, *the default linking rule* applies:

- When there is an intransitive verb, and the lone argument will be linked to the *grammatical function of subject*.
Linguists classify languages in terms of the order in which grammatical functions are expressed:

- SVO (Subject-Verb-Object), SOV (Subject-Object-Verb), etc. That is, we need these grammatical functions for syntactic purposes.

In many languages, morphology is used to mark grammatical functions, either through head marking or through dependent marking.
Case marking is a form of dependent marking which signals the grammatical function of an NP in a clause.

Indo-European languages with morphological case systems show the distinction between grammatical subject and grammatical object by means of the opposition between the nominative case and the accusative case.
If there is only one argument, this argument is case-marked as a nominative.

When there are two arguments, the subject is marked as nominative and the object as accusative.

This system is called the Nominative-Accusative system.
An alternative case system is the *Absolutive-Ergative system*, used in many Australian languages.

The following symbols are used (Dixon 1994: 6-7):

- **S** = Intransitive subject
- **A** = Transitive subject
- **O** = Transitive object
In the Nominative- Accusative system A and S receive the same case marking.

In the Absolutive- Ergative system O and S receive the same case marking:

• This system marks the object of transitives and the subject of intransitives using the same case: **absolutive**; subjects of transitives are marked with a different case: **ergative**.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAS</th>
<th>PREDICATE, $x$</th>
<th>PREDICATE, $x$</th>
<th>$y$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical function</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative-Accusative system</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutive-Ergative system</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ABS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dutch

- Der Mann lach-t
  The man NOM laugh-PRES.3SG
  “the man(S) laughs”

- Der Mann kauf-t ein Buch
  The man NOM buy a book ACC
  “the man (A) buys a book (O)”

GRAMMATICAL FUNCTIONS AND CASE MARKING
Dyirbal

• ṣuma nanaga-nyu
  Father ABS return- NONFUT
  “Father (S) returned”

• yabu ṣuma-ŋgu bura-n
  Mother ABS father ERG see- NONFUT
  “Father (A) saw mother (O)”
In some cases, it is not only the case marking that is ergative in nature, but also the syntax; as can be seen in the construction of elliptical sentences.

In ellipsis, the second of two identical NPs in coordinated clauses is omitted, as illustrated below for English:

- E.g. John (A) saw his wife (O) and—(S) rejoiced.
- Here the transitive subject (A) and the intransitive subject (S)- which has been omitted- refer to the same NP.
Essentially, we see that the case marking that an NP takes in a clause determines the grammatical function that it occupies on the syntactic level and vice versa:

- Syntactic constructs may form parts of complex words (morphology), and syntax in its turn governs the use of morphological case marking on words.
MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTACTIC VALENCY
The relation between the PAS and the level of grammatical functions can be changed by morphological operations.

The best known and widely studied example of such a change is PASSIVIZATION.

In this operation, the agent of the predicate is demoted to the status of an adjunct.
The remaining argument, if any, will then receive the status of **S**, and receive the **nominative case** in the nominative-accusative system.

This is illustrated in Greenlandic Eskimo:

- **a)** *inuit* **nanuq**
  - people.**ERG.PL** polar.bear.**ABS.SG**
  - *taku-aat*
  - see-**3PL.3SG.IND**

“**The people saw the polar bear**”
b)  *nanuq*  (inun-nit)

  polar.bear.<sub>ABS.SG</sub>  people.<sub>ABL.PL</sub>

  *taku-niquar-puq*

  *see*-PASS-3SG.IND

“The polar bear was seen (by the people)"

> In (b), the **passive suffix** has the effect of making the original subject **optional**.
It can be added as an **adjunct**, marked with **ablative case**; whereas in the active sentence it is marked with the ergative case.

In (a), the person, number, properties of both the plural agent and the singular patient are marked on the verb.

In (b) it is only the properties of the singular patient that are marked on the verbal form.
This is because of the non-argument status of the Agent in (b).

In present-day Romance and Germanic languages like French and English, there is no synthetic passive form of verbs.

Instead, a *periphrastic construction* is used, consisting of a passive auxiliary and a participle.
E.g.

- Je suis insulté par Jean

I be 1SG.PRES insult-PAST.PTCP.MASC.SG by Jean

“I am insulted by Jean”

- **Passivization** is an operation that affects the mapping between PAS level and the grammatical function level.

- It is not an operation on the semantic level since it does not change meaning.
Only the form in which the meaning is expressed is changed.

This is also proven by the fact that the demoted Agent of the verbal predicate is semantically still available, for instance as a “controller”.

MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTACTIC VALENCE
Example:
a) The boat was sunk to collect the insurance money.
b) *The boat sank to collect the insurance money.

With the passive sentence in (a), the demoted agent is still there semantically, as the implicit subject of the verb [collect] in the embedded infinitival clause.
In (b), the intransitive, non-passive verb \textit{sink} is used, and hence there is no agent involved at all.

Consequently, an appropriate controller of the subject of \textit{collect} is not available in sentence (b), making it ungrammatical.
The essence of passivization is the *demotion* of the Agent argument, not the *promotion* of the Patient argument.

The promotion of the Patient to the status of grammatical subject is as a result of the *default linking rule*.

The default linking rule requires that if there is only one argument, it should be expressed as the *grammatical subject*.
Dutch and German exhibit passivization of intransitive verbs. (Impersonal passive)

E.g. Er werd enthousiast
there AUX.PASS.PAST.IMPF enthusiastically
gedanst.
dance PAST.PTCP

“There was enthusiastic dancing.”
In the above sentence, the agent is no longer mentioned explicitly, and since the verb *dansen* “to dance” is intransitive, there is no other argument that can be linked to the subject position.

However, since Dutch clauses with finite verbs always require the presence of a subject, the subject position is filled with a dummy word: *er*. 
The different patterns of linking arguments to grammatical functions are also referred to as different VOICES:

• Active voice
• Passive voice
• Middle voice

Voices express the semantic relations between the subject and the action described by the verb.
The grammarians of Sanskrit and Greek speak of the middle voice as a distinct verbal form, just as we may have different aspectual forms of a verb.

The use of the middle voice instead of the active voice does not mean that the mapping of semantic roles on grammatical functions is different.
However, the middle voice marker changes the status of the subject with respect to the denoted action. Below is an example from Sanskrit:

a) Devadattah katam karoti
   Devadatta.\text{NOM} mat.\text{ACC} make.\text{SG}
   “Devadatta makes a mat”

b) Devadattah katam krute
   Devadatta-\text{NOM} mat.\text{ACC} make.\text{SG}
   “Devadatta makes himself a mat”
Thus, as the example shows, the middle voice indicates that the subject is also the *beneficiary* of the action expressed by the verb.
ANTI-PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION

Instead of the Agent, the O (transitive object) can also be demoted. This is the anti-passive construction, found in particular in languages with an absolutive-ergative system.

In this construction, the O can be omitted, or appear with instrumental case. Hence, you get an intransitive sentence.

The following example is from Greenlandic Eskimo:
a) inuit tuqup-pai
people. ABS.PL kill-3SG.3PL.INDIC
“He killed the people”

b) inun-nik tuqut-si-vuq
people. INSTR kill-ANTIPASS-3SG.INDIC
“He killed people”
• Sentence (a) exhibits the normal case marking.

• In (b) we have an intransitive sentence, with the word for “people” marked with an instrumental case.

◆ The effect of the anti-passive is to ‘despecify’ the direct object of the transitive verb, if it is expressed at all.
Hence, (b) does not refer to specific people that were killed.

Note also that the *person-number* properties of “people” are no longer marked on the verb. It is only the instrumental case that is marked.
APPLICATIVE CONSTRUCTION

- Instead of demoting an argument, you may also promote it.

- This is the applicative construction that is found in many African and Austronesian languages.

- For instance, the effect of adding an applicative affix to the verb may promote an instrumental or locative NP to the status of O(transitive object).
E.g. Atlantic language, Wolof.

a. Mungi lekk ag kuddu
   PRES.3SG eat with spoon
   “He is eating with a spoon”

b. Mungi lekk-e kuddu
   PRES.3SG eat-APPL spoon
   “He is eating with a spoon”
Also, an applicative affix can introduce an additional beneficiary argument.

E.g. Mexican language, Classical Nahuatl:

- Ni-c-no-pa¯qui-lia
  I-it-myself-wash-APPL
  “I wash it for myself”
NOUN INCORPORATION is another way of making transitive verbs intransitives.

It is when an argument of the verb is not expressed by a separate NP, but as part of a verbal compound. The verbal compound then functions as an intransitive verb.
The following example, a one-word-sentence, comes from the Amerindian
language Tuscarora:

- w-e-khw-əti-?

FACTUAL-FEM.AGENT-food-make-PERF

“she meal-made = she cooked”
In Tuscarora, verbs with incorporated nouns co-occur with verbs with independent noun phrases. The difference is that the verb with incorporated noun denotes an institutionalized action, whereas the independent noun phrases have referential potential.
This functional difference is nicely illustrated by the fact that in Tuscarora you can have constructions of the type *She bread-made corn*, with both an incorporated noun and an independent NP, meaning “She made corn-bread” (Mithun 1999: 46).
The nature of Noun Incorporation;

❖ Suppose we had an English verbal compound: 

\textit{wood-chop}

❖ \textit{[Chop]} is the head of the compound and \textit{[wood]} is the incorporated NP.

❖ The PAS of \textit{chop} is \textit{Chop x, y}
The NP y is [wood] which is incorporated into the verbal compound.

The only other NP, x takes up the position of the grammatical subject, and thus, the verb behaves as an intransitive.
What we see here, is that the semantic interpretation of a complex verb may lead to a syntactic valency that is different from that of its verbal head.

The phenomenon of noun incorporation has led some linguists to propose that some kinds of word-formation can be accounted for by syntactic operations.
Here, the incorporated noun is represented as an independent NP at the underlying syntactic level.

The noun is then moved to be adjoined to the V in the surface representation, resulting in a verbal compound.

For instance, the fictive English verbal compound “to bed-buy” would be derived as follows:
I buy bed

MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTACTIC VALENCY
The noun *bed* originates in the object position of the VP, which is then vacated.

The empty position is indicated by *t* (for trace), and is co-indexed with the moved *N*.

Through this co-indexation, the incorporated *N* will be interpreted semantically as the object of the verb.
And so in this analysis the intransitivization effect of this kind of noun incorporation is the effect of a syntactic operation.

CAUSATIVES

- The choice of a morphological or a syntactic analysis of word-formation plays a role in the analysis of causatives.

- Causative verbs are verbs where the A has the role of the causer of an event in which one or two entities play a role.

- A classic example of a simplex causative verb in English is *to kill*, with the meaning “cause to die”.
The semantic structure of this predicate can be represented as follows:

\[
\text{CAUSE}\ (x,\ (\text{DIE},\ y))
\]

Sentences with causative verbs denote complex events.

Many languages have causative affixes that turn non-causative verbs into causative ones. The semantic effect is the addition of a predicate \text{CAUSE} and an additional argument, the \text{‘CAUSER’}. 
Hence, causativization has the effect of increasing the valency of words. This applies to adjectives, nouns and verbs.

E.g. Diyari, an Australian language:

- kidi “clever” (adj.) > kidi-ŋanka “to teach = to make clever”
- muka “sleep” (noun) > muka-ŋanka “to put to sleep”
Examples from Turkish

• Müdür mektub-u imzala-dt •
  director letter-DO sign-past
  “The director signed a letter”

• disçi mektub-u müdür-e imzala-t-tt •
  dentist letter-DO director-IO sign-CAUS-PAST
  “The dentist made the director sign a letter”
This example shows how the addition of a causative suffix increases the valency of a verb. It is an example of a valency-increasing operation.

Note that, causativization is a morphological process that primarily affects the semantic properties of a predicate, and hence the level of PAS.

A CAUSER argument is added to the PAS of the input word, which affects its syntactic valency through the linking rules that map arguments onto the grammatical function frame of a verb.
A syntactic approach to causativization assumes that the causative suffix functions as a verb with a complement that denotes the caused event.

However, the causative verb is a bound morpheme so it cannot surface as a word of its own, and must be combined with a verbal stem.

The verb of the embedded clause is moved to the higher clause, and attached through adjunction to the left of the causative suffix that functions as the verb of the main clause.
Ali Hasan öl dür
Ali Hasan die CAUS "Ali killed Hasan"

MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTACTIC VALENCE
In sum, verbs may carry morphological markings that determine how their arguments must be expressed on the level of syntactic structure. The syntactic valency of verbs may thus be affected by morphology.
PERIPHRASIS AND CONSTRUCTIONAL IDIOMS
Periphrasis is used in situations where single morphological forms of certain constructions cannot be found. Instead, a word combination has to be used: an analytic form.

Constructional idioms are multi-word expressions that are idiomatic in nature but not completely fixed because some positions are variable.
Examples of periphrasis English are the use of auxiliaries + participles of main verbs to express the perfect tense like; “had called” and the passive voice; “was called”.

In a number of languages, the progressive aspect is expressed by a periphrastic form of the verb ‘to be’ + prepositional phrase, as illustrated by the following examples from Dutch:
  John is at the cycle-INF
  “John is cycling”

• Jan is de aardappels aan het schillen
  John is the potatoes at the peel-INF
  “John is peeling the potatoes”
It is key to note that in the second example, the direct object *de aardappels* “the potatoes” is not located right before the verb, as is normally the case for objects in Dutch embedded clauses.

Instead, *the object* precedes the word sequence *aan het* “at the” that signals the progressive aspect.
Progressive aspect may also be expressed by using postural verbs such as “to sit” and “to stand” in coordination with a main verb, as illustrated here for Afrikaans and for West-Flemish, a dialect of Dutch:
**Afrikaans**

Piet staan ’n glas water en drink  
Pete stands a glass water and drink  
“Pete is drinking a glass of water”

**West Flemish**

Zij zat kousen   en   stoppen  
She sat stockings and mend-INF  
“She was mending stockings”

PERIPHERASIS AND CONSTRUCTIONAL IDIOMS
Note that it is only the postural verb in the West Flemish sentence that has a finite form, the main verb appears in the infinitive. (In Afrikaans there is no formal difference between infinitive and finite forms).

Such constructions with a periphrastic function are constructional idioms.
Many languages have **preverb + verb** combinations that function similarly to prefixed verbs.

The notion *preverb* refers to words that appear before verbs, and form a close unit with that verb. Quite often, these phrasal constructions function as alternatives to prefixed verbs.

A Dutch example of a preverb+verb construction is this: *af V* with the meaning “to finish V-ing”.
af is a Dutch particle that expresses a result. It turns (in the following example) the intransitive verb werken “to work” into a resultative predicate:

- Bettelou werkte haar opdrachten af
  Bettelou worked her assignments PARTICLE
  “Bettelou finished her assignments”

Particle verbs are lexical units, but not words in the morphological sense.
Analytic causative constructions are also instantiations of constructional idioms.

In Germanic and Romance languages, the causative meaning is often not expressed by an affix, but by a separate causative verb such as laten “to let” in Dutch and fare “to do” in Italian.

The combination of the causative and the main verb functions as a unit, and the recipient is marked by a preposition, aan in Dutch, and a in Italian:
Dutch
Ik liet het boek aan mijn collega zien
"I showed the book to my colleague"

Italian
Ho fatto vedere il libro a-l mia collega
"I showed the book to my colleague"
The unitary nature of *liet zien* and *ho fatto vedere* manifests itself in the fact that they select a recipient argument marked by a preposition, whereas neither the causative verb nor the main verb select a recipient on their own.
Another type of constructional idiom that is functionally similar to complex verbs is that of SERIAL VERBS, found in many African, Austronesian, and Papua languages.

Characteristics of such constructions are that the two (or more) verbs denote a single event. There is only one overt subject, and one tense marker.
São- Tomense (Portuguese- based creole)

- *Bisu vwa subli*
  
  bird fly.\textsc{past} go.up

  “The bird flew upwards”

- *Zon toma mantchin kota po*
  
  Zon take.\textsc{past} machete cut tree

  “Zon cut the tree with the machete
In sum, languages may have syntactic, analytic alternatives to the morphological expression of meaning. These syntactic alternatives may have the status of lexical units and may exhibit special syntactic behaviour.
We see from the above discussion that Morphology does not just interact with Syntax, these two branches of linguistics actually interface. That is, they influence one another.

Morphology can dictate how Syntax is represented or expressed, and vice versa.