

## Preface

Jochen Trommer & Andreas Opitz

One-to-many relations play a crucial role in two major research areas of current grammatical theory: quirky identity and paucity of resources. This volume collects ten papers addressing these topics from different perspectives, focussing on new theoretical approaches to long-standing empirical problems. The ideas and analyses documented in these contributions have emerged in the context of the international scientific network *Core Mechanisms of Exponence* and the research project *Argument Encoding in Morphology and Syntax* (as part of the DFG-Forschergruppe 742). As in the predecessor volume *Linguistische Arbeits Berichte 84*, language data are drawn from a large sample of Indoeuropean (Hindi, Old French, Bulgarian, Romanian, German, Latin, Old Irish) and non-Indoeuropean languages (Southern Tiwa, Siroi, Bonan, Yurok, Diyari, Seerer-Siin, Tlapanec). The theoretical frameworks adopted range from the Minimalist Program over Distributed Morphology to different versions of Optimality Theory.

Paucity of resources is a prominent theme in current research on “Person-Case-Constraint” (PCC) effects (Bonet, 1991), where specific cooccurrences of two clitics or agreement markers corresponding to different object DPs lead to ungrammaticality. According to the prevalent view, PCC effects result from configurations where two DPs are within the domain of a single probing head, and effectively compete for the featural resources of the probe (Rezac, 2004; Anagnostopoulou, 2006). In the paper by Heck and Richards, this line of research is extended to the polysynthetic system of Southern Tiwa which shows a complex array of restrictions on agreement for three arguments and incorporation. A second syntactic incarnation of resource paucity addressed in the paper by Georgi and Müller can be found in constructions where a single syntactic head serves multiple duty, and reprojects in a higher position to satisfy different checking requirements of the same argument. In morphological theory, paucity of resources pops up wherever different morphosyntactic categories compete for realization in the same morphological slot (Anderson, 1992; Noyer, 1992; Stump, 2001) or conversely where a single category could be realized in different slots (e.g. a clitic and an agreement slot), but is restricted by the morphological

system to one position (Woolford, 2003). These still poorly understood phenomena are addressed in detail in the papers by Biskup, Opitz, and Trommer raising substantial questions on the extent of these restrictions in the face of obvious redundancy in morphology, and on their interplay with the pervasive effects of prominence scales in morphosyntax (Aissen, 2003).

Syncretism, i.e. paradigmatic identity, is one of the best-known instances of one-to-many relations: one word form (or one part of a word form) is used in different paradigmatic slots. Recent work in morphological typology (Cysouw, 2003; Baerman et al., 2005) has shown that there are a number of generalizations not captured by existing analyses, and challenging counter-examples to apparent crosslinguistic generalizations on possible syncretism (“quirky syncretism”). Current approaches to quirky syncretism either try to reduce it to more natural types of syncretism (Trommer, 2006), or resort to formally unrestrictive rules of referral (Baerman, 2005), both strategies having their specific shortcomings. A number of papers in this volume explore more radical cures: Müller develops a morphological system which replaces traditional rules or units of exponence by “meaning-less” markers whose distribution is governed by the interaction of morphological-phonological cooccurrence restrictions and a strictly phonologically driven preference for more sonorous formants. The papers by Weisser and Lahne attack quirky syncretism from another angle, and interestingly enough the approaches they propose are based on embracing paucity of resources: unusual syncretism patterns are triggered by paradigmatic cells which must be filled by exponents also used in other cells due to the lack of better-suited markers and subject to specific wellformedness and minimality conditions. Two more papers address quirky identity under an interface perspective: The paper by Keine argues that previously syntactically analyzed syncretism patterns in the case marking system of Hindi are actually due to standard morphological means. Zimmermann and Trommer defend a correspondence-theoretic analysis of fixed-segmentism reduplication, i.e. formations where reduplication comes along with overwriting affixation, which may backcopy to the base of reduplication.

## References

- Aissen, J. (2003). Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 23(3):435–483.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (2006). Strong and weak person restrictions: A feature checking analysis. In Heggie, L. and Ordoez, F., editors, *Clitics and Affixation*, pages 199–235. Amsterdam.
- Anderson, S. R. (1992). *A-Morphous Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baerman, M. (2005). Directionality and (un)natural classes in syncretism. *Language*, 80(4):807–827.
- Baerman, M., Brown, D., and Corbett, G. (2005). *The syntax-morphology interface: a study of syncretism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bonet, E. (1991). *Morphology after syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance*. PhD thesis, MIT.
- Cysouw, M. (2003). *The Paradigmatic Structure of Person Marking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Noyer, R. R. (1992). *Features, Positions and Affixes in Autonomous Morphological Structure*. PhD thesis, MIT.
- Rezac, M. (2004). *Elements of Cyclic Syntax: Agree and Merge*. PhD thesis, University of Toronto.
- Stump, G. T. (2001). *Inflectional Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trommer, J. (2006). Plural insertion is constructed plural. In Müller, G. and Trommer, J., editors, *Subanalysis of Argument Encoding in Distributed Morphology*, volume 84 of *Linguistische Arbeits Berichte*, pages 197–228. Institut für Linguistik: Universität Leipzig.
- Woolford, E. (2003). Clitics and agreement in competition: Ergative cross-referencing patterns. In Carpenter, A. C., Coetzee, A. W., and de Lacy, P., editors, *Papers in Optimality Theory II*, volume 26 of *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers*, pages 421–449. Amherst: GLSA.

