

Overriding default orderings in Paradigm Function Morphology

Gregory Stump, University of Kentucky

ABSTRACT

In inferential-realizational descriptions of a language's inflectional morphology, two sorts of linear ordering must be stipulated: the linear order of an affix with respect to the stem to which it attaches (is it a prefix or a suffix?) and the linear order in which blocks of realization rules apply in the definition of a word's form (does the application of Block X presume the application of Block Y, or is it the other way around?). Both sorts of order may be regulated by defaults and overrides: (i) a particular affix may have a default ordering with respect to the stem with which it joins but may exhibit the opposite ordering in the realization of particular morphosyntactic property sets; (ii) similarly, two rule blocks may have a default order of application in the definition of inflected word forms but may exhibit the opposite order of application in the realization of particular morphosyntactic property sets. I refer to overrides of type (i) as DEFAULT-AFFIXATION OVERRIDES and those of type (ii) as DEFAULT-COMPOSITION OVERRIDES.

Default-affixation overrides are widely observable. In Swahili, the relative affixes (which code the noun class of a verb's relativized argument) are ordinarily prefixal, as in (1a,b); but they are suffixal in tenseless affirmative verb forms, as in (1c). (See Stump [1993:138ff] for discussion.)

- (1) a. *vitabu a-na-vyo-vi-soma* *Hamisi*
books.NC8 SBJ.AGR(NC1)-TNS-REL(NC8)-OBJ.AGR(NC8)-read Hamisi.NC1
'the books which Hamisi is reading'
- b. *vitabu a-si-vyo-vi-taka* *Hamisi*
books.NC8 SBJ.AGR(NC1)-NEG-REL(NC8)-OBJ.AGR(NC8)-want Hamisi.NC1
'the books which Hamisi doesn't want'
- c. *vitabu a-vi-taka-vyo* *Hamisi*
books.NC8 SBJ.AGR(NC1)-OBJ.AGR(NC8)-want-REL(NC8) Hamisi.NC1
'the books which Hamisi wants'

Default-composition overrides are likewise quite common. In the relative past tense of Fula verbs, the block of rules spelling out object suffixes applies, in the default case, after the block of rules spelling out subject suffixes, as (2a,b) show; but when first-person singular subject-marking coincides with third-person singular (class 1) object marking, the blocks apply in the opposite order, as (2c) shows. (See Stump [2001:149ff] for discussion.)

- (2) a. *mball-u-mi-be'* b. *mball-u-daa-mo'*
help-REL.PAST.ACT-SBJ:1SG-OBJ:3PL(NC2) help-REL.PAST.ACT-SBJ:2SG-OBJ:3SG(NC1)
'I helped them' 'you (sg.) helped him'
- c. *mball-u-moo-mi'*
help-REL.PAST.ACT-OBJ:3SG(NC1)-SUBJ:1SG
'I helped him'

To account for these two phenomena, I propose two operators for the formulation of realization rules: these are the DEFAULT-AFFIXATION OPERATOR [$>$] and the DEFAULT-COMPOSITION OPERATOR [\circ] defined in (3) and (4). In Swahili, the relative affix *vyo* is introduced by means of [$>$]: by default, [$>\sigma$, *vyo*, X] = *vyoX*; but when σ is an affixation-inversion property set (affirmative and tenseless), [$>\sigma$, *vyo*, X] = *Xvyo*. In Fula, the relative sequence of the subject- and object-agreement rule blocks SUBJ and OBJ is defined by means of [\circ]: by default, [$\circ\sigma$, OBJ, SUBJ] = (OBJ \circ SUBJ); but

when σ is a composition-inversion property set (first-singular subject with third-singular [class 1] object), $[\circ\sigma, \text{OBJ}, \text{SUBJ}] = (\text{SUBJ} \circ \text{OBJ})$.

(3) Definition of the default-affixation operator [$>$]

Where σ is a morphosyntactic property set and X, Y are phonological expressions:

$[>\sigma, X, Y] = YX$ if σ is an affixation-inversion property set; otherwise, $[>\sigma, X, Y] = XY$.

(4) Definition of the default-composition operator [\circ]

Where σ is a morphosyntactic property set and m, n are rule blocks:

$[\circ\sigma, m, n] = (n \circ m)$ if σ is a composition-inversion property set; otherwise, $[\circ\sigma, m, n] = (m \circ n)$.

I show that the postulation of these operators affords an analysis of French pronominal clitics in which each of the clitics in (5) is introduced by one or the other of the two rule blocks in (6) and (7).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(5) a. <i>Il me le donnera.</i>
 b. <i>Donnez-le-moi!</i>
 c. <i>Il le lui présentera.</i>
 d. <i>Présentez-le-lui!</i></p> | <p>(7) Block II: Where $\mu = \text{OBJ}$ or DAT,
 $[>\sigma:\{\mu:\{1\text{sg}\}\}, me, X]$ (shape alternant: <i>moi</i>)
 $[>\sigma:\{\mu:\{2\text{sg}\}\}, te, X]$ (shape alternant: <i>toi</i>)
 $[>\sigma:\{\mu:\{3.\text{Refl}\}\}, se, X]$ (shape alternant: <i>soi</i>)
 $[>\sigma:\{\mu:\{1\text{pl}\}\}, nous, X]$
 $[>\sigma:\{\mu:\{2\text{pl}\}\}, vous, X]$
 $[>\sigma:\{\text{DAT}:\{3\text{sg.nonRefl}\}\}, lui, X]$
 $[>\sigma:\{\text{DAT}:\{3\text{pl.nonRefl}\}\}, leur, X]$</p> |
| <p>(6) Block I
 $[>\sigma:\{\text{OBJ}:\{3\text{sgM.nonRefl}\}\}, le, X]$
 $[>\sigma:\{\text{OBJ}:\{3\text{sgF.nonRefl}\}\}, la, X]$
 $[>\sigma:\{\text{OBJ}:\{3\text{pl.nonRefl}\}\}, les, X]$</p> | |

In this analysis, French pronominal clitics have prefixation as their default pattern of affixation and $(\text{II} \circ \text{I})$ as their default pattern of rule-block composition, as in (5a). They do, however, exhibit default-affixation overrides in affirmative imperatives (e.g. (5b,d)) and elsewhere exhibit default-composition overrides in sentences in which a third-person nonreflexive direct-object clitic (from Block I) appears with a third-person nonreflexive dative clitic (from Block II) (e.g. (5c)). This novel conception of French pronominal clitics (which can be easily extended to accommodate the nonpronominal clitics *y* and *en*) has three advantages over other analyses: (a) it minimizes the number of rule blocks that need to be postulated to account for the distribution of French pronominal clitics; (b) it directly relates the ordering of proclitics to that of enclitics; and (c) it entails (rather than stipulates) the so-called Person Case Constraint (8), which excludes sentences such as **Il me lui présentera*. The operators [$>$] and [\circ] afford a similar analysis of the Portuguese clitic facts, an alternative to the analysis proposed by Luís & Spencer 2005.

- (8) Person Case Constraint: *1st/2nd/*se* accusative clitic + nonethical dative clitic. (Rezac 2010:155)

References:

Bonami, Olivier, & Gilles Boyé. 2007. French pronominal clitics and the design of Paradigm Function Morphology. In G. Booij et al. (eds.), *On-line Proceedings of the Fifth Mediterranean Morphology Meeting (MMM5)*, 291-322. Bologna: University of Bologna.

Luís, Ana, & Andrew Spencer. 2005. A paradigm function account of ‘mesoclisism’ in European Portuguese. In G. Booij & J. van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 2004*, 177-228. Dordrecht: Springer.

Miller, Philip, & Ivan A. Sag. 1997. French clitic movement without clitics or movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15, 573-639.

Rezac, Milan. 2010. Ineffability through modularity: Gaps in French clitic clusters. In M. Baerman et al. (eds.), *Defective paradigms : Missing forms and what they tell us*, 151-180. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Stump, Gregory T. 1993. Position classes and morphological theory. In G. Booij & J. van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1992*, 129-180. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Stump, Gregory T. 2001. *Inflectional morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.