Distributed morphology today: Morphemes for Morris Halle ed. by Ora Matushansky and Alec Marantz (review)

Nicholas Welch

→ For additional information about this article
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/cjl/summary/v059/59.3.welch.html

All in all, *Aspects of Split Ergativity* makes an important contribution to the understanding of why splits in case alignment follow a consistent pattern cross-linguistically. It presents a compelling account of the ways in which many unrelated languages (whether ergative or not) may show similarities in the structures used to convey different aspectual relations. Coon also offers a very detailed and well-argued analysis (coupled with vast data sets) of the syntax of complementation, predication, and nominalization in Chol Mayan. This may serve as groundwork for further exploration of these or related phenomena in other languages or language families. This book will be a useful and interesting read for syntacticians, morphologists, and typologists alike, as well as those working on the semantics of predication and/or temporal relations.

REFERENCES

Baker, Mark C. 2003. *Lexical categories: Verb, nouns and adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Demirdache, Hamida and Myriam Uribe-Extebarria. 2000. The primitives of temporal relations. In *Step by step: Essays on Minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 157–186. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Farudi, Annahita and Maziar Doustdar Toosarvandani. 2005. The loss of ergativity in Dari modal verbs. In *Oxford working papers in linguistics, philology and phonetics*, ed. Anna McNay, 149–160. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ora Matushansky and Alec Marantz, eds. 2013. *Distributed morphology today: Morphemes for Morris Halle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Pp. xvi + 262. US$40.00 (hardcover).

Reviewed by Nicholas Welch, *University of Toronto*

This collection of papers within the Distributed Morphology (DM) framework (Halle and Marantz 1993, 1997; Halle 1997) is an extended argument for interpretational, multi-domain views of morphology. Some chapters (e.g., McGinnis, Noyer, Oltra-Massuet) assume DM and offer solutions to language-specific problems; others argue for DM on theoretical and empirical grounds. DM rejects a separate morphological module, placing morphology in interfaces between syntax and other modules: the lexicon, semantics, and phonology. This volume explores all these interfaces, though semantics has received less attention; a pity, since cross-linguistically, there exist numerous interesting morphosemantic issues which still await any formal analysis.

Chapter 1 (Isabel Oltra-Massuet) examines variations (one synthetic, two periphrastic) of Catalan past perfectives, which — unusually — can employ the verb 'go' as an auxiliary. Oltra-Massuet invokes an abstract MOTION morpheme, inserted at *v*. Unconventionally, she proposes that the multiple surface forms are derived from one underlying structure, as a result of competing grammars. This neatly captures the data, but sacrifices a close mapping between underlying and surface structures. Her account depends on the interaction of inner aspect with other TAM categories. She challenges views of inner aspect as wholly lexical and takes it to be a syntactic

phenomenon. She argues that only such an analysis correctly accounts for the Catalan data, while competing analyses make incorrect predictions.

Chapter 2 (Rolf Noyer) explores Proto-Indo-European (PIE) morphophonology. Noyer derives stress directly from morphological structure, expanding Halle and Vergnaud's analysis (Halle and Vergnaud 1987, Halle 1997). Noyer proposes PIE foot boundaries match the boundaries of accent-bearing morphemes, and controversially allows for both leftward and rightward stress assignment such that accent (which attracts stress) can be specified to be at either edge of a foot. Further, to explain certain stress patterns, Noyer claims some morphemes are specified with left and right foot boundaries, and some with neither. He proposes cyclic and post-cyclic stress-assignment and erasure rules in an analysis which strongly recalls pre-Optimality Theory (OT) rule-based phonology with Strict Cyclicity (Halle 1978, Kiparsky 1985, Kenstowicz 1994), though adding iterative access to morphology.

Chapter 3 (Martha McGinnis) tackles Georgian agreement. Using feature geometry, following Harley and Ritter (2002) and Béjar (2003), McGinnis posits separation between person and number features and between third-person and first/second-person plurals, which she argues are featurally different. Similarly, she argues for fission of T into separate Tense and Aspect nodes under some (vocabulary-driven) conditions. Her analysis depends on competition between morphemes to realize features, so that the third-person plural suffix is blocked from appearing on non-third-person forms by the fusional person-number prefixes of first- and second-person agreement. McGinnis's account deploys a wide range of the current apparatus of DM: fission, partial feature discharge, competition, and clitic tucking.

Chapter 4 (Ora Matushansky) argues that English synthetic comparatives and superlatives are better explained by head movement (Corver 1997, Bobaljik 2012, among others) than by post-syntactic processes (Embick and Noyer 1999). Matushansky proposes that modifying adverbs affect the acceptability of synthetic comparatives/superlatives, and that both suppletion facts and phonological constraints point to adjective roots being spelled out before suffixation. Her arguments, however, hinge on some questionable judgments such as: *brightest*/*#most bright*, *more dead*/**deader than Napoleon*. Unfortunately, the examples above are all attested in Google searches; *deader than Napoleon* has over a thousand hits, *more dead than Napoleon* fewer than a dozen. These facts undermine her arguments against Embick and Noyer.

Chapter 5 (Tatjana Marvin) argues for the relevance of morphological structure to English stress assignment. Marvin posits that the stress facts of multiple suffix-ation and "mixed suffixes" (those that affect stress inconsistently) arise naturally from spell-out by phase, while a surface-based OT account (Burzio 1994) does not successfully predict these facts. Marvin points out that the semantics of word pairs formed with mixed suffixes tends to vary with the stress, suggesting that the suffixes are being attached at different levels of structure: directly to roots, or to fully-formed words whose semantics (and stress) have already been affected by functional projections. Further, in multiple suffixation, outer suffixes can affect the stress pattern of inner suffixes, but not of roots, suggesting phase impenetrability.

Chapter 6 (Alec Marantz) examines locality constraints on contextual allomorphy and allosemy in English, Japanese, and Greek, arguing that these phenomena are best explained under Minimalism and DM. Marantz focusses on violations of locality constraints, proposing that in such cases, a phase head that would otherwise impose a barrier is "relevantly null" — that is, empty semantically (for allosemy) or phonologically (for allomorphy), whereas whenever such a phase head is non-null in these senses, locality constraints apply. This chapter can be seen as a companion to Matushansky's, as both argue for phase-edge effects as the cause of morphological irregularities which are otherwise difficult to explain.

Chapter 7 (Heidi Harley and Mercedes Tubino Blanco) investigates the relationship between regular morphophonology and the vagaries of the lexicon in Hiaki. Harley and Tubino Blanco argue that the (often unpredictable) forms of Hiaki stems are subject to phonological constraints with lexically restricted domains. In other words, stem classes, which determine the relationship between free and bound verb stems, are properties not of abstract morphemes, but of individual vocabulary items. Therefore, such constraints must operate on vocabulary items inserted post-syntactically. They adduce evidence that the Hiaki stem alternations are not true suppletion, showing that principled phonological relationships exist between all free and bound stem forms, but that these relationships do not depend upon abstract classes.

Chapter 8 (Daniel Harbour) argues for bivalent features and against privative ones across modules. Harbour demonstrates that bivalence can generate distinct feature geometries for trial and paucal number, whereas privative approaches (Harley and Ritter 2002) assume that the difference is interpretational. He applies similar arguments in favour of bivalent person features in Hopi, Kiowa, Damana, and Limbu. He shows that bivalence elegantly handles the inverse number system of Kiowa and person-case relations in Tewa, concluding that although he finds the case for bivalence strong, both its proponents and those of privativity should devote further effort to proving their positions.

Chapter 9 (David Embick) argues for morpheme-based morphological theories in general and against affixless theories such as Anderson (1992). Embick's central principle is that morphophonological rules operate locally to the morphological domains where they are triggered, rather than applying without restriction within the word. In an affixless theory, he claims, there is no reason to expect the plural of *dog* to be /dɔgz/ rather than, say, /dzɔg/, since there are no morpheme edges involved. I am not certain this is correct — is there a reason why morphophonological rules cannot target edges of phonological domains? Nonetheless, Embick poses questions that affixless proponents may need to address.

Chapter 10 (Eulàlia Bonet) examines agreement asymmetries, arguing that they reflect a division between syntactic and post-syntactic agreement. Bonet demonstrates that previous accounts either over- or mispredict asymmetries between agreement in pre- and post-nominal adjectives in Spanish and Asturian. Her solution accounts for post-nominal agreement in the syntax, while applying OT faithfulness constraints to account for the differing facts of pre-nominal agreement. She acknowledges in her conclusion that, in order to explain apparently lexical restrictions on

agreement, this solution could require roots to be present in the syntax: is this a partial return to lexicalism?

Chapter 11 (Jonathan David Bobaljik and Susi Wurmbrand) argues for kinship between two phenomena: control and ECM verbs require particular temporal interpretations of their complements, and only adjectival roots with comparative allomorphs (such as *tall/taller*) can have superlative allomorphy (*tallest*). Bobaljik and Wurmbrand claim that both these cases derive from suspension of locality restrictions iff a morphosyntactic item depends upon a higher head for its (phonological or semantic) interpretation. They draw three conclusions:

a. cyclic locality restrictions (such as phases) apply in all modules of grammar

b. their domains are more dynamic than in standard phase theory (Chomsky 2000)

c. conditioned suspension of these domains is also a general property of grammar

Chapter 12 (Karlos Arregi and Andrew Nevins) examines theoretical motivations for the application of the Elsewhere Principle (Kiparsky 1973) within DM. Arregi and Nevins use evidence from Biscayan Basque and Bulgarian to support the priority of contextually specific rules over elsewhere rules, contra Halle and Marantz (1993). They argue that contextually determined neutralization of elsewhere rules occurs both in the Basque case system, where a maximally distinct three-way case distinction is modified by the attachment of case clitics on both edges of the nominal stem, and in the disappearance of Bulgarian gender-number distinctions in particular morphosyntactic/phonological environments. Arregi and Nevins' claim suggests re-evaluating the ordering of rules within DM.

This book gives an excellent overview of the current state of DM research and presents a range of new data. Even if readers do not agree with all the conclusions, they will come away with a deeper understanding of the theoretical and empirical issues being debated within the DM framework. It will certainly generate new research questions and drive further dialogues in the field.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Stephen. 1992. *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Béjar, Susana. 2003. Phi-syntax: A theory of agreement. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2012. *Universals in comparative morphology: Suppletion, superlatives, and the structure of words*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Burzio, Luigi. 1994. *Principles of English stress*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In *Step by step: Essays on Minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–156. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Corver, Norbert. 1997. *Much*-support as a last resort. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28:119–164.

Embick, David and Rolf Noyer. 1999. Locality in post-syntactic operations. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics (MITWPL) 34: Papers in morphology and syntax*, ed. Vivian Lin, Cornelia Krause, Benjamin Bruening, and Karlos Arregi, 265–317. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. In *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. Kenneth Hale and Samuel J. Keyser, 111–176. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halle, Morris and Jean-Roger Vergnaud. 1987. *An essay on stress*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halle, Morris. 1978. *Formal versus functional considerations in phonology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Halle, Morris. 1997. On stress and accent in Indo-European. *Language* 73:275–313.

Harley, Heidi and Elizabeth Ritter. 2002. Person and number in pronouns: A feature-geometric analysis. *Language* 78:482–526.

Kenstowicz, Michael. 1994. *Phonology in generative grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1973. "Elsewhere" in phonology. In *Festschrift for Morris Halle*, ed. Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, PAGES??. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1985. Some consequences of Lexical Phonology. In *The structure of phonological representations*, Vol. 1, ed. Harry van der Hulst and Norval Smith, 131–175. Dordrecht: Foris.