



LOCALITY CONSTRAINT $\sqrt{\text{gives}}$ AN INSIGHT INTO SUPPLETION

UNIVERSITÄT
LEIPZIG

Hyunjung Lee
hyunjung.lee@uni-leipzig.de
Universität Leipzig

Irene Amato
irene.amato@uni-leipzig.de
Universität Leipzig



Nutshell

♣ **Suppletion** is an interesting phenomenon, since it is subject to a general **locality constraint** on allomorphy and may thus display intervention effects (Harley, H. & R. Noyer 1999, Bobaljik 2012).

Embick's (2010) Adjacency Hypothesis:

- (1) $\alpha - \beta : \alpha$ can condition β
 $\alpha - \gamma - \beta : \gamma$ blocks conditioning of β by α .

- *Weak* version of locality: Only heads with overt exponence count.
- *Strong* version of locality: All heads count.

♣ Chung (2009) has accounted for the interaction between negation and honorification in Korean, discussing defective intervention.

♣ We provide a new dataset about the three-way suppletive allomorphy of $\sqrt{\text{give}}$:

- /tuli/ in cases of honorific datives
- /tal/ in certain **imperative** contexts
- /cwu/ elsewhere

- The insertion of the allomorph /tal/ is problematic for the strong version of locality:

- (2) $\sqrt{\text{VERB}} - \text{NEG} - \text{HON} - \text{TNS} - \text{MOD} - \text{C}_{[\text{Imp}]}$

Research Questions:

What are grammatical restrictions imposed on the conditioning the suppletive allomorphy?

Background

- **Distributed Morphology:** division of labor between the components of grammar.
- Syntax only manipulates abstract morpho-syntactic features.
- Morphology may adjust the structure.
- At Vocabulary Insertion, a morpheme is replaced by the phonological exponent of a Vocabulary Item if this matches all or a subset of the features in the morpheme (Subset Principle).
- Allomorphs are phonological exponents in competition for the same grammatical features.

Data

/cwu/ ~ /tuli/

- ♣ The elsewhereform for $\sqrt{\text{give}}$ is /cwu/, as in (3a-b).
 - ♣ If the indirect object is honorified as in (3c), allomorph /tuli/ blocks the elsewhere form /cwu/.
- (3) a. Chingwu-ka na-ekey satang-ul **cwu**-ess-ta.
friend-NOM I-DAT candy-ACC give-PST-DECL
'The friend gave me a candy.'
- b. **Sensayngnim-kkeyse** na-ekey satang-ul
teacher-HON.NOM I-DAT candy-ACC
cwu-si-ess-ta.
give-HON-PST-DECL
'The teacher gave me a candy.'
- c. Nay-ka **sensayngnim-kkey** satang-ul
I-NOM teacher-DAT.HON candy-ACC
tuli-ess-ta.
give-PST-DECL
'I gave the teacher a candy.'

/tuli/ insertion is not problematic for the locality condition (cf. its lexical entry 7-a).

/cwu/ ~ /tal/

- ♣ /tal/ is confined to imperative contexts in which the dative argument is coreferential with the speaker as in (4a):

Speakerⁱ ... Addressee^j ... **Recipient**ⁱ.

- ♣ /cwu/ appears as a free variant in the same context (4a).

- (4) a. (Ne) na-ekey satang-ul **cwu/tal**-la.
you.NOM I-DAT candy-ACC give/give-IMP
'Give me a candy.'
- b. (Ne) na-ekey satang-ul **cwu/*tal**-ci-ma-la.
you.NOM I-DAT candy-ACC give/give-CI-NEG-IMP
'Do not give me a candy.'
- c. (Sensayngnim,) na-ekey satang-ul
Teacher-HON.NOM I-DAT candy-ACC
cwu/*tal-si-la.
give/give-HON-IMP
'(Teacher,) give me a candy (please).'

The free variation (4a) is problematic under every interpretation of the locality condition.

Assumption

- ♣ We assume a SAP projection on top of CP where Speaker and Addressee are located.
- ♣ The local context for vocabulary insertion is met through the following morphological operations:

- (5) **Pruning rule** (Embick 2010):

$\sqrt{\text{Root}} \curvearrowright [\mathbf{x}, \emptyset], [\mathbf{x}, \emptyset] \curvearrowright \mathbf{Y} \rightarrow \sqrt{\text{Root}} \curvearrowright \mathbf{Y}$

- ➔ It eliminates nodes with zero exponents cyclically.
- ➔ We suggest this rule applies optionally.

- (6) **Node-sprouting rule** (Choi & Harley 2017):

HON⁰-sprouting rule: $v^0 \rightarrow [v^0 \text{ HON}^0] / [\text{DP}[+\text{HON}] [\dots v^0 \dots]]$

- ➔ A sprouted [+HON] agreement morpheme (HON⁰) is adjoined to a v^0 node c-commanded by a honorific nominative NP.

- (7) Vocabulary items:

- $\sqrt{\text{GIVE}} \Leftrightarrow /tal/ / \text{DP}_{\text{DAT}}[\pi:\text{Speaker}] \text{ — } [\text{IMP}]$
 $\Leftrightarrow /tuli/ / \text{ — } \text{DP}_{\text{DAT}}[+\text{HON}]$
 $\Leftrightarrow /cwu/ \text{ elsewhere}$
- [HON] $\Leftrightarrow /si/$
- [IMP] $\Leftrightarrow /la/$
- [PRS] $\Leftrightarrow \emptyset$
- [NEG] $\Leftrightarrow /mal/ / \text{ — } [\text{IMP}]$

Proposal

- ♣ **Stringent locality constraint should hold for suppletion.**
- ♣ **The free variation can be explained with the optional application of the morphological operation.**

Analysis

/tal/ insertion

- ➔ The free variation between /tal/ and /cwu/ is explained by the (non-)application of the **Pruning** operation, which deletes the T node with [PRS] that has a zero exponent.

- (8) Scenario 1: Pruning of T node
- [CP [TP ... [_vP ... [VP DP_{dat}^{π:Speaker} ...] $v + \mathbf{V}_j + \sqrt{\text{GIVE}}$] **T**_[PRS]] **C**_[IMP]]
- ↓ *Pruning*
- [CP [TP ... [_vP ... [VP DP_{dat}^{π:Speaker} ...] $v + \mathbf{V}_j + \sqrt{\text{GIVE}}$] **C**_[IMP]]
- ↓ *Vocabulary Insertion*
- [CP [TP ... [_vP ... [VP DP_{dat}^{π:Speaker} ...] $v + \mathbf{V}_j + /tal/$] /la/]

- (9) Scenario 2: No Pruning
- [CP [TP ... [_vP ... [VP DP_{dat}^{π:Speaker} ...] $v + \mathbf{V}_j + \sqrt{\text{GIVE}}$] **T**_[PRS]]] **C**_[IMP]]
- ↓ *Vocabulary Insertion*
- [CP [TP ... [_vP ... [VP DP_{dat}^{π:Speaker} ...] $v + \mathbf{V}_j + /cwu/$] \emptyset] /la/]

Blocking effects for /tal/ insertion

- ➔ When the Addressee bears an [+HON] feature, it triggers v^0 to fission into [v^0 HON⁰] by **Node-sprouting**.

- ➔ **Hon⁰** is an intervener between the verb root and the C head.

- (10) [SAP Addr_[+HON] [CP ... [VP DP_{dat}^{π:Speaker} ...] $v + \mathbf{V}_j + \sqrt{\text{GIVE}}$] **C**_[IMP]] ...]
- ↓ *v⁰ Sprouting*
- [SAP **Addr**_[+HON] [CP ... [VP DP_{dat} ...] $v + \mathbf{V}_j + \sqrt{\text{GIVE}} + \text{Hon}^0$] **C**_[IMP]]]
- ↓ *Vocabulary Insertion*
- [SAP ... [CP ... [VP DP_{dat}^{π:Speaker} ...] $v + /cwu/ + /si/$] /la/]]

- ➔ In this context, the (non-)application of Pruning does not affect the outcome.

- ➔ As expected, /tal/ is blocked with intervening honorification as in (4c), and the same mechanism applies to the case of negation as in (4b).

Conclusion

- ♣ We have provided further evidence that a stringent **locality condition** must hold for conditioning suppletive allomorphy.
- ♣ Our analysis has accounted for the cases of (i) the transparent intervention effects and (ii) the opaque patterns (counterbleeding & counterfeeding) under a strong locality condition.

Remaining Hard Nut

- ♣ We observe the clear patterns intertwined of the **benefactive** argument.

- (11) a. [Aki²-lul wihey] na¹-ekey ku kal-ul **tal**(\succ **cwu**)-o.
baby-ACC for I-DAT that knife-ACC give-IMP
'Give me that knife for the sake of the baby.'
- b. [Emma¹-lul wihey] na¹-ekey ku sacin-ul **cwu**(\succ **tal**)-o.
mom-ACC for I-DAT that picture-ACC give-IMP
'Give me that picture (so that I can give it to my mom).'

- ♣ How can preference of alternations regarding on relative saliency of recipients be explained?

- ♣ The difference of the actual recipient of the object determines the choice of allomorphs between /tal/ and /cwu/.

	Speaker	Recipient	Benefactive	allomorph
(11-a)	1 (I)	1	2 (baby)	/tal/ \succ /cwu/
(11-b)	1 (I)	2 (mom)	2	/cwu/ \succ /tal/