

The scope and limits of realizational morphology: Evidence from uninterpretable phi

We use 'uninterpretable phi' phenomena to investigate realizational morphology, M , in the architecture of the grammar. These phenomena are those where the realization of an element α depends on (is controlled by) the interpretable phi-feature(s) of element β . The M revealed by the investigation is (i) a module of which syntax and interpretation are strongly autonomous, (ii) sensitive to information partly distinct from syntax, and (iii) computationally partly distinct as well, executing featural syncretisms and deletions that syntax cannot but within domains limited to word-like units. This traditional picture is investigated against three current challenges:

- (A) Nonmodular architectures and modular architectures with $M \rightarrow$ syntax/interpretation channels.
- (B) Limitation on M to bar morphosyntactic feature syncretism / deletion, necessarily attributing e.g. a dative-locative syncr. to syntax+lexicon (Manzini and Savoia 2002, 2009, Kayne 2008).
- (C) Extension of M to span nonadjacent phrasal units like syntax, e.g. to domains of A-movement (Marantz 1991, Bobaljik 2008; syntax \rightarrow PF branch of the Y on certain views).

The empirical domain contrasts two sets of phenomena for (i-iii): [see overleaf for exx.]

- (1) Traditional allomorphies, to be cast as syntax/lexicon under (B): focus is on syncretisms and deletions in Romance 3.DAT+3.ACC clitic clusters and in 1/2 \leftrightarrow 2/1 agreement combinations.
- (2) Phenomena superficially similar to (1), to be cast as M under (C): noncanonical realizations of dative as locative, direct as oblique, clitic/agreeing pronoun as strong nonagreeing pronoun in function of the phi-features of another element in *person hierarchy* phenomena, including *inverse* and *Person Case Constraint* configurations [French, Georgian, Arizona Tewa, etc.].

Examination of (1) reveals a clustering of the following properties w.r.t. (i-iii) above: (i) syntactico-semantic invisibility: a 3.DAT \rightarrow LOC / __3.ACC syncretism retains all the properties of a 3rd person dative clitic (thematic, binding, ...), not locative; same for deletions. (ii) Information not visible to syntax may be pertinent, notably phonological realization (of adjacent clitics) or lexical identity of host. (iii) The computation is not that of syntax: First, were it to be coded syntactically, it is shown to expand the power of selection / movement in a way never seen in e.g. A-movement. Second, an uninterpretable phi phenomenon with properties (i), (ii) always seems to only pay attention to and affect information within a word/phrase-like domain. \Rightarrow *The component responsible (1) is not syntax nor visible to syntax, against (B).*

The limitation of (1) to word-like units is unexpected on (C), yet it seems to hold. E.g. 1PL \rightarrow 3SG(PL) / __2PL(+PAST) without effect on syntax/interpretation is common agreement morphemes as in (1bc), but seems unattested for independent pronouns, linked to morphemes so affected or not (1b). Phenomena of type (2) are superficially counter-examples. However, they are shown to betray all the hallmarks of syntax on (i-iii): (i) They affect binding, floating quantifier licensing, relativization, etc. (ii) They are sensitive to morphologically neutralized syntactic information, and not to purely morphophonological info. (iii) The tools for coding them are within the scope of independent syntactic mechanisms such as A-movement locality. \Rightarrow *There are no long-distance versions of the allomorphy of type (1), against (C) unless constrained.*

Finally, the groupings of properties found for (1) and (2) seem to be exclusive: there are no intermediates, e.g. allomorphies of type (1) for (ii) and (iii) but visible to syntax for (i). This argues for a strong encapsulation of syntax from M : both against general nonmodular arch's (Bresnan 2001; cf. Embick & Marantz 2008, Trommer 2003), but also against channels from $M \rightarrow$ syntax or \rightarrow interpretation to which uninterpretable phi would be visible, such as might exist for e.g. focus (Szendroi 2005) or copy spellout/interpretation (Bobaljik 2001).

- (1) a Je *la lui* rendrai → remains, or...
 I 3SGF.DAT 3SG.ACC will.return
- ∅(*l*)*ui* [3.ACC → ∅ / __3.DAT]
 - y (**l*) a [3SG.DAT → LOC / __3.ACC *only if* l-elision]
 (nb: *l*-elision indep., but not otherwise in 3.DAT+3.ACC)
 - y [3SG.DAT 3.ACC → LOC]
 - *y la, *l'y, *lui a*
 a/b/c + dat doubl. strong pronoun for focus: à *lui/elle* 'to him/her'

(French varieties: Morin 1978, 1979, Bonami & Boyé 2006, Rezac 2008; cf. Bonet 1991 for Catalan)

- b Su-k gu ikusi g-aitxu-su > d-o-su
 you-ERG us.ABS seen 1PL-AUX-2SG DFLT-AUX(ERG-ABS)-2SG
 [2SG/PL.ERG→1PL.ABS ⇒ 2SG/PL.ERG→3SG.ABS in Ondarroa Basque]

- c Ikusi zait-u-gu > z-ara
 seen 2PL-AUX(ERG-ABS)-1PL 2PL-AUX(ABS)
 [1PL.ERG→2PL.ABS ⇒ 2SG/PL.ABS in Ondarroa Basque]

(Arregi and Nevins 2006, 2008, Egaña 1984; cross-ling: Heath 1991, 1998)

(2) Person Case Constraint repair in French:

DAT clitic → unfocussed strong pronoun / %locative clitic / __1/2.ACC (and not elsewhere) if DAT is not applicative DAT.

- a Elle **me leur* présentera → √*me* ∅ présentera à *eux*
 she me.ACC them.DAT will.introduce %*m'y* présentera (à *eux*)
- b Elle *la leur* présentera → **la* ∅ présentera à *eux*
 she her.ACC them.DAT will.introduce **l'y* présentera (, à *eux*)

(Couquax 1975, Postal 1990, Rezac 2008)