

Anti-Exhibitionism of Featural Markedness in Exponence

Andrew Nevins (Harvard University)

Leipzig Exponence Network, June 2007

A Central Question in Exponence Theory

Q: If something is morphosyntactically marked (e.g. plural), shouldn't it be "marked" by "more stuff"?

A: NO!

Markedness in two distinct modules

- φ -Markedness: The asymmetric grammatical treatment (syncretizational, defectivizational) of one of the values of a binary (or n-ary) opposition.
B is more φ -marked than *A* if *B* consists of more marked φ feature-values than *A*
 (e.g. +Fem, +Pl, +Auth, +Neg)
- Material markedness: (Never actually formally defined in practice, but "you know it when you see it", supposedly):
 More phonological material: i.e.
B is more Materially-marked than *A* if *B* consists of a greater number of (supra)segments/syllables/sonority points than *A*
 (e.g. *zagabla* is more materially-marked than *fo* or \emptyset)

Implicitly we know that these often diverge

A look at any of the papers in *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte* #84 or similar collections will reveal numerous pairwise violations of isomorphisms or alignment of abstract and concrete markedness.

I want (us) to explore something else that I have been suspecting may be the case:

Not only do these diverge, but φ -Markedness often realized by exponents that are **Less** Materially-Marked. In other words, there is a preference to “mark” marked-features by *less* stuff.

I will call this the Anti-Exhibitionism principle, but as we explore it together, this name can be changed.

Outline

- 1 When the Marked (the adjective) does not get Marked (the verbal participle)
- 2 Il y a des portmanteaux?
- 3 Scattered Sharing of the Mark of Cain
- 4 Quo Eo?

”Implicational markedness is a matter of abstract rather than concrete marks” - Zwicky, *Die Sprache*

Implicational generalizations over Impoverishment patterns

Markedness-based impoverishment

- Basque g/z constraint, Kadiweu “disappearance of the marked” :
Impoverishment of marked [+Part] in context of adjacent [+Part]
- Dual → Pl: Impoverishment of context-sensitive-marked [–augmented] in context of [–singular]
- 1pl syncretisms: Impoverishment of marked features yielding featural identity/non-distinctness
- 1+Neg gets impoverished in various ways for expected *amn't*
- *The φ -Marked does not like to be Materially-Marked*

By contrast: Is Kayne Able?

- (Exponence theory?: All *within* “syntax” is silent anyway...)
- impoverishment ~ silent clitic: se LE lo
- what are features of silent clitic? cf. *se la* with fem.dat and masc.acc
- “Silent first person plurals” generated in unprincipled range of envts
- Distribution of Silent lexical items unconnected to syntagm/paradigmatic markedness

A central question of generativism: *im lo achshav, eimati?*

Kayne 2006 mentions without explanation: “there is no silent 2pl or 3pl that can “co-occur” with locative *ci*.

“French *on* licensed by silent NOUS in: *on a tous ri*”

“Italian *si* licensed by silent NOI in *si e’ arrivati tutti*”

But why does only silent NOI trigger plural verbal agreement?

Me: French *on* is a case of general impoverishment across φ -bearing heads

but Italian *si* allows 1pl reading based on interpretive factors, e.g. aspect (D’Alessandro): this is not a case derived by exponence-ops alone. The “silent syntax” theory blurs an actual division of labor between PF and LF

Anti-Exhibitionism Continues: Don't (Over)-Expose the Marked...

$[x] \rightarrow /FO/, [y] \rightarrow /MU/, \text{ but } [x] + [y] \rightarrow /ZA/$

- x is zero in context of y ?
- y is zero in context of x ?
- x is Z in context of y , y is A in context of x

Why should a speaker go for this mutual allomorphy in just these argumental combinations?

Marked Combinations where Portmanteaux Arise

- 1+Neg
- 1+2
- 1PI
- Dual

Marked Combinations

- 1+Neg
- 1+2
- 1PI
- Dual

1+Neg in Swahili

- ni-tataka i wanted
- u-tataka you wanted
- ha-u-tataka you didn't want
- si-tataka i didn't want

SD: nodes [1][2] on same M-word

SC: rewrite as P

P → /si/

1+2 in Caddo

yah-ku is 2ag,1obj, transparent

1ag : ci

2p: si

expected 1ag, 2obj: ci si (no relation to Italian imp refl cluster!)

But: instead, fused *t'a*

See Heath IJAL 98 for tons of (leads but as is typical of such overviews, data-sparse) cases of 1-2 combinations yielding portmanteau

1+PL and discontinuous bleeding

Basque, Semitic, Georgian: Pers prefixes & Number suffixes

1pl: always prefix-only, lack of fission/circumfixes

“Less stuff” for a marked combination, viewable as P-rewriting of two distinct terminals

Warlpiri dual

1pl: -na- and -lu

1dl: unanalyzable *litjara*

marked 1, marked dual: rewrite terminals as single P_{25}

Diagonal and Discontinuous Syncretisms

Politeness in Italian

Case & Number in Basque

Affixal “Re-Use” (a la Wunderlich 2007) precisely for φ -marked
guys:

Local implementation?

Italian: Fem and Formal $\in M$

	Pronoun	Clitic
2[−Hon]	tu	te
2[+Hon]	Lei	La
3[+fem]	lei	la
3[−fem]	lui	le
3pl	loro	gli

Note: The capitalization in orthography means nothing; these are phonologically identical

Traditional accounts of Pl/Formal Syncretisms: Pluralizing your addressee is a way of showing deference (e.g. “you” are big enough, symbolically, to comprise a group)

Plausible for why Italian honorification uses the Feminine forms?

Shared Exponence for the Marked

There is no feature that 3rd [+Fem] and 2nd [+Hon] share in common.

But at a very abstract level of speaking, they do: they both instantiate φ -markedness

Béjar & Hall (ESCOL 99) have a specific implementation in terms of markedness-points for VIs

Referral to an Exponence Class

- +Fem \rightarrow M
- +Hon \rightarrow M

M is an exponence-class

lei \rightarrow [M, +subj]

la \rightarrow [M, +obj]

Allows possible innovative divergence of fem without formal pronoun changing

Intermediate class allows exponence to be shared principally but without direct *referral*

Another case that surprised me: Basque case/number

gizon 'man (indef)'

gizon-a 'man-abs'

gizon-**ak** 'man-abs.pl'

gizon-**ak** 'man-**erg**.sg'

gizon-ek 'man-erg.pl'

It's not possible to say -k is 'erg alone' or 'plural alone'.

-k is used for both erg & pl

Case/Num: erg → M, +pl → M

Pattern Perhaps generalizable to Lahne's cases when other chess-diagonal covered by elsewhere

Other Implementations are Possible, but fact remains

Two Marked categories share a single exponent and the result is not obviously derivable from impoverishment, nor is the fact that they share something meta-/abstract in common (i.e. both being marked) captured in standard rules of referral.

Mueller 2007 and Weisser 2007 (apud Mueller 2007) develop different implementations, but the end result is a sort of global Anti-Exhibitionism: the φ -marked uses a smaller set of Material-Markers

Material-Markedness Reduction is Accomplished by

- Obliteration → No realization of the containing terminal
- M-Rewriting: Re-used realization of the containing terminal
- P-Rewriting: Fused realization of two containing terminals

Inflectional Exponence may not be Iconic, At the very least I want to clarify what we as morphoscenti should keep as distinct and non-aligned concepts.

Bonan Mongolian: Better Left to Impoverishment

		noun	pronoun
Nom	+subj	∅	∅
Gen	+subj,+obj	ne	ne
Acc	-subj,+obj	ne	de
Dat	-subj,+obj,+obl	de	de

- /∅/ ⇔ [+subj]
 /de/ ⇔ [-subj,+obj,-adv]
 /ne/ ⇔ [+obj,-adv]
- Impoverish [-subj] in context of [-pronominal].
 Knocks /de/ out of competition for Acc.