Preface

Sebastian Bank, Doreen Georgi & Jochen Trommer

Agreement with 2 arguments has proven to be one of the most fertile areas of research in theoretical morphology and syntax of the last 2 decades. The transitive agreement systems of Georgian and Potawatomi have been crucial to the development of a new generation of realizational approaches to morphological exponence (Anderson 1992; Halle & Marantz 1993; Wunderlich 1996; Stump 2001; Trommer 2003), but also important for the technical notion of Agree in minimalist approaches to syntax (Béjar 2003, Béjar & Rezac 2009; cf. also the crucial role of syntactic agreement with 2 (object) arguments in the recent discussion of Person-Case-Constraint effects, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Adger & Harbour 2007). This volume of Linguistische Arbeits Berichte collects contributions to both lines of research originating in the DFG research projects *Micro- and Macro-variation: Hierarchy Effects in Kiranti and Broader Algic* (TR 521-3), *The Internal Structure of Person Portmanteaus* (TR 521-4-1), and more generally the DFG-Forschergruppe 742 (*Grammar and Processing of Verbal Arguments*).

Apart from addressing transitive agreement (i.e. subject and object agreement in transitive clauses), all papers in this volume also address additional local relations of 2 linguistic entities of various kinds. More specifically, they discuss the theoretical or empirical tension between different types of binarity and unarity in grammatical theory. Thus at the theoretical level **Georgi's** paper argues that in Mordvin, 2 syntactic goal arguments (subject and object) compete for a single number and a single person probe for feature checking. The hypothesis she pursues is that the number probe shows actually 2 faces in the sense that it impoverishes under specific syntactic contexts in a way which allows it to target person instead of number features. Splitting syntactic agreement into 2 probes, 1 for person and 1 for number also plays a crucial role in the paper by **Assmann**, who analyzes Tagalog, but at a more abstract level: Tagalog doesn't show any overt agreement morphology, but only a complex context-sensitive

system of case marking. Despite the surface appearance, Assmann shows that the assumption of a covert agreement system in tandem with positing hidden expletives correctly derives morphological argument encoding and the person-case constraint restrictions the language exhibits.

Descriptively, the paper by Georgi as well as the one by **Kröhnert** discuss the concatenative status of agreement morphology in Uralic languages (Kröhnert in a comparative survey of Enets, Nenets, and Nganasan - Georgi in a detailed case study of Mordvin) and conclude on the basis of extensive evidence from syncretism that the portmanteau inventories which have been claimed for these languages must be systematically subanalyzed into 2 components resulting in systems with transparent separate marking for subject and object agreement. Kröhnert goes even further and proposes that many of the apparently monosegmental affixes in Uralic consist actually of 2 affixes, one consisting of a segment and the other one of subsegmental material – i.e. phonological features. The paper by **Hamann** defends a different type of subanalysis (see Müller & Trommer 2006 for detailed discussion of subanalysis more generally) in a Distributed-Morphology analysis of the Papuan language Lavukaleve, where most markers are shown to be decomposed into separate person and number (or gender) affixes. Symptomatically Lavukaleve also shows extended exponence (Müller 2006) such that specific 2nd person heads are marked by 2 agreement markers (which must in turn be decomposed resulting in 2 x 2 = 4 agreement affixes marking a single syntactic head) which Hamann captures by a constraint-based enrichment approach. **Henze & Zimmermann** argue in their analysis of the Algonquian language Potawatomi against the claim of Halle & Marantz (1993) that clauses in the language have 3 different agreement heads of a language-specific type. Instead they propose that Potawatomi has just 2 standard (but fused) heads for subject and object agreement respectively, where the surface appearance of more complexity and blocking are derived from feature hierarchies which govern lexical insertion. The assumption which proves crucial for a proper understanding of Potawatomi verb inflection is that affixes are marked for a binary parameter as to whether they affect only the features they explicitly specify or whether they make all features of the head they target inert for further insertion.

The volume contains 2 detailed analyses of agreement in Karuk, a Californian Hokan language which is loosely related areally, and closely typologically to Algonquian (and hence Potawatomi): **Sappir,** who provides an analysis in classical Distributed Morphology, proposes that, contrary to previous claims

on languages of the hierarchical agreement type (Béjar 2003; Trommer 2006), there is no explicit requirement in the language that verb agreement is restricted to 1 argument (a tension which would then be resolved by feature hierarchies). Instead the apparent restriction of agreement to one argument follows from a variety of fine-grained impoverishment rules which are directly connected to prominence hierarchies, leading thus to a considerable simplification of the overall analysis. On the other hand, the paper by **Bank** argues that Karuk is basically a language exhibiting object agreement, which switches to subject agreement only for cases where the latter substantially outranks the object in prominence. More specifically, he proposes that subject agreement obtains if and only if the object is outranked by the subject by at least 2 steps on the relevant feature hierarchy. En passant, Bank also introduces a new general formalism capturing hierarchy effects in agreement which does not invoke optimality-theoretic constraints (Aissen 2003; Aranovich 2007) or complex assumptions on feature representation (Béjar 2003; Heck & Richards 2007), but is based on a general construction algorithm which allows to derive language-specific hierarchies of categories from universal rankings of single features. A partial analysis of Karuk is also provided in the paper by **Trommer**, who also discusses transitive agreement in the Kiranti languages Limbu and Kulung, and focusses on Ainu (a language isolate formerly spoken in parts of Japan). Trommer addresses the question of why inflectional affixes often show a dual behavior, and exhibit a completely regular distribution in part of the paradigm and a more quirky one in other parts. This is derived by a formalism where the morphosyntactic features of affixal morphemes (i.e. of markers, not of input structures as in Distributed Morphology) can be impoverished in the context of specific paradigm cells leading to a generalization of these affixes into new paradigmatic space. This is related to a learning mechanism for morphological grammars which predicts segmentation of suffix strings and the assignment of featural content to single affixes on the basis of the behavior potential affix morphemes show in areas with completely regular distribution. The paper by **Bank & Henze** focusses in a more formal way on general learning techniques for inflectional markers in transitive agreement. After showing that transitive agreement poses specific problems for learning, not observed under more simple learning scenarios (Pertsova 2007), they introduce a new feature formalism which allows to capture portmanteau-like markers in a succinct way and gives rise to a simple intersection operation for learning.

References

Adger, David & Daniel Harbour (2007): The syntax and syncretisms of the Person Case Constraint, *Syntax* 10(1), 2–37.

Aissen, Judith (2003): Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. Economy, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23(3), 435–483.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena (2003): *The Syntax of Ditransitives: Evidence from Clitics*. Studies in generative grammar, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Anderson, Stephen R. (1992): *A-Morphous Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aranovich, Raúl (2007): Optimizing Verbal Agreement in Mordvin, *Studia Linguistica* 61(3), 185–211.

Béjar, Susana (2003): Phi-Syntax: A Theory of Agreement. PhD thesis, University of Toronto.

Béjar, Susana & Milan Rezac (2009): Cyclic Agree, *Linguistic Inquiry* .

Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz (1993): Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection. In: K. Hale & S. J. Keyser, eds., *The View from Building 20*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, pp. 111–176.

Heck, Fabian & Marc Richards (2007): A Probe-Goal Approach to Agreement and Incorporation Restrictions in Southern Tiwa. In: J. Trommer & A. Opitz, eds., *1 2 Many: One-to-many relations in grammar*. Vol. 85 of *Linguistische Arbeits Berichte*, Institut für Linguistik: Universität Leipzig, pp. 205–239.

Müller, Gereon (2006): Extended Exponence by Enrichment: Argument Encoding in German, Archi and Timucua. Ms., University of Leipzig, available under http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~muellerg/mu227.pdf.

Müller, Gereon & Jochen Trommer, eds. (2006): *Subanalysis of Argument Encoding in Distributed Morphology*. Vol. 84 of *Linguistische Arbeits Berichte*, Institut für Linguistik: Universität Leipzig.

Pertsova, Katya (2007): Learning Form-Meaning Mappings in Presence of Homonymy. PhD thesis, UCLA.

Stump, Gregory T. (2001): *Inflectional Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trommer, Jochen (2003): Distributed Optimality. PhD thesis, University of Potsdam.

Trommer, Jochen (2006): Hierarchy-based Competition and Emergence of Two-Argument Agreement in Dumi, *Linguistics* 44(5), 1011–1057.

Wunderlich, Dieter (1996): A Minimalist Model of Inflectional Morphology. In: C. Wilder, M. Bierwisch & H.-M. Gärtner, eds., *The role of economy principles in linguistic theory*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, pp. 267–298.