Ojibwe agreement in a representational, morpheme-based framework

Paul B. Melchin[†], Ash Asudeh[‡,†] and Dan Siddiqi[†]
[†] School of Linguistics and Language Studies, Carleton University
[‡] Department of Linguistics, University of Rochester

The primary insights of Distributed Morphology (DM; Halle and Marantz 1993) are not inherently bound to the Minimalist Program (MP; Chomsky 1995). At its core, DM is a realizational, morpheme-based theory of morphology in which word-formation takes place through ordinary syntactic rules and processes. Syntactic terminal nodes contain only abstract morphosyntactic features, which are realized by vocabulary items. While for historical reasons DM has always been associated with MP, and worked on within a Minimalist framework, we claim the insights of DM can be integrated into a completely different theoretical framework, namely Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG; Bresnan et al. 2016). The resulting theory, Lexical-Realizational Functional Grammar (LRFG), combines the strengths of the two frameworks. Like LFG, it is a representational and constraint-based theory (without the bottom-up, phase-based derivations of MP) that is ideally suited to modelling nonconfigurationality. Like DM, it provides a realizational, morpheme-based view of word-formation, provides an account for the mirror principle, and is good at modelling complex morphological structures including those found in polysynthetic languages.

In our poster, we demonstrate LRFG, taking Ojibwe agreement morphology as a case study. We take insights from syntactic analyses of Ojibwe verbal morphology (including Déchaine 1999; Oxford 2014, 2019; Barrie and Mathieu 2016) regarding the categories and featural content of the relevant morphemes and adapt them to an LFG-style formalism. We show that it is possible to provide a syntactic analysis of Ojibwe agreement and the direct-inverse system without relying on the derivational tools used by the above authors, namely without (head or phrasal) movement, articulated agreement probes, feature valuation and impoverishment, and so on. Instead, we put to use the tools available to LFG, including the correspondences and mapping between c(ategorial)-structure (syntactic structures), f(unctional)-structure (abstract feature structure), and sem(antics)-structure (semantics and argument structure), along with the featural specifications of the VIs and the rules of exponence we have formulated for LRFG (building on the theory of Spanning such as in Ramchand 2008; Merchant 2013; Haugen and Siddiqi 2016; Svenonius 2016).

In this way, we demonstrate that LFG is not inherently bound to a theory of word-formation in which word forms are stored in the lexicon as syntactic atoms and constitute terminal nodes in the c-structure (see also Wescoat 2002, 2005). Instead, the terminal nodes correspond to (spans of) morphemes; this provides an explanation for the generalization that the order of bound morphemes within a word corresponds to the order of free morphemes of the same categories (Baker's 1985 Mirror Principle). This allows realizational morphology to be read directly off c-structure, rather than through the intermediate step of a m-structure as in Dalrymple (2015). The resulting framework does not assume the notion of *Lexical Integrity* (Bresnan et al. 2016, p. 92), although the notion of Post-Linearization Spanning ensures something like Wescoat's (2002; 2005) *Homomorphic Lexical Integrity*; LFG can now be compatible with the lexical-realizational (morpheme-based; see Stump 2001) approaches

that are typical of analyses of polysynthetic morphology. We also demonstrate that the morphology of a polysynthetic language can be analyzed as a complex phrasal structure, mirroring the clausal structures of more familiar languages, without relying on derivational processes.

References

Baker, M. (1985). The mirror principle and morphosyntactic explanation. *Linguistic Inquiry 16*(3), 373–415.

Barrie, M. and E. Mathieu (2016). Noun incorporation and phrasal movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 34*, 1–51.

Bresnan, J., A. Asudeh, I. Toivonen, and S. Wechsler (2016). *Lexical-Functional Syntax*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dalrymple, M. (2015). Morphology in the LFG architecture. In M. Butt and T. H. King (Eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG15 Conference*, pp. 65–83. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Déchaine, R.-M. (1999). What Algonquian morphology is really like: Hockett revisited. In L. Bar-el, R.-M. Déchaine, and C. Reinholtz (Eds.), *Papers from the Workshop on Structure & Constituency in Native American Languages*, pp. 25–72. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Halle, M. and A. Marantz (1993). Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In S. J. Keyser and K. Hale (Eds.), *The View from Building 20*, pp. 111–176. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Haugen, J. D. and D. Siddiqi (2016). Towards a restricted realizational theory: Multimorphemic monolistemicity, portmanteaux, and post-linearization spanning. In *Morphological Metatheory*, pp. 343–386. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Merchant, J. (2013). How much context is enough? two cases of span-conditioned stem allomorphy. *Linguistic Inquiry 46*(2), 273–303.

Oxford, W. (2014). *Microparameters oa Agreement: A diachronic perspective on Algonquian verb inflection*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Toronto, Toronto.

Oxford, W. (2019). Inverse marking and Multiple Agree in Algonquin. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 37*(3), 955–996.

Ramchand, G. C. (2008). *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon: A First Phase Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stump, G. T. (2001). *Inflectional Morphology: A Theory of Paradigm Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Svenonius, P. (2016). Emergent extended projections. Paper presented at MIT on November 4, 2016.

Wescoat, M. T. (2002). *On Lexical Sharing*. Ph. D. thesis, Stanford University.

Wescoat, M. T. (2005). English nonsyllabic auxiliary contractions: An analysis in LFG with lexical sharing. In *Proceedings of the LFG05 Conference*.