

Redundancy and Spellout Domains in Menominee

Jochen Trommer – University of Osnabrück

Woolford (2003) discusses languages where pronominal clitics and verb agreement are dynamically in complementary distribution: If crossreferencing of an argument by a clitic isn't possible, this is taken over by otherwise impossible agreement. She adduces this pattern mainly to three optimality-theoretic constraints: **XRef** which requires that all arguments are crossreferenced by clitics or agreement, ***agree** which penalizes agreement and ***clitic** penalizing clitics. According to different rankings, this results in (1) languages with crossreferencing by clitics (2) languages with crossreferencing by agreement (3) languages without crossreferencing and (4), by interspersing additional wellformedness constraints on clitics, languages where crossreferencing happens by agreement and clitics in different contexts. Crucially, an argument should never be referenced redundantly by both a clitic and by agreement. In this talk, I argue that this last conclusion is too strong: Languages *can* have crossreferencing by clitics and agreement at the same time. Thus in Piattino (Northern Italian, Gerlach, 2001) cooccurrence of subject clitics and corresponding agreement is optionally possible, and in Bavarian (Weiss, 1998) it is partially obligatory. I propose to maintain the basic insight behind Woolford's approach by assuming that clitics and agreement affixes are the spell-out of underlying chains with the schematic form in (1):

- (1) (NP_{*i*}) Clitic_{*i*} V Agr_{*i*}

PARSE constraints require the realization of ϕ -features for all pronominal parts of such a chain:

- (2) a. the clitic
b. the Agr Head
c. the chain itself

If the constraints for (a) and (b) are ranked above corresponding markedness constraints, we get crossreferencing by clitics *and* agreement. Otherwise (according to the relative ranking of the (a) and (b) constraints) we get only clitics, only agreement or no crossreferencing at all, just as in Woolford's approach.

Further evidence for this approach comes from languages such as Menominee (Bloomfield, 1962) where clitics and agreement seem to be largely independent from each other since they double person features. However in special contexts when clitics are generally suppressed, agreement "takes over" person marking which is otherwise omitted. Conversely, neutralization of person features in the agreement of negative verbs leads to emergence of 3rd-person clitics not appearing in other paradigms. Thus we find double crossreferencing (the result of PARSE for (a) and (b)), but also complementary distribution effects (the result of PARSE for (c)) for the same syntactic positions. This is only possible if markedness constraints as well as PARSE constraints operate in parallel on chain- and head-level.

References

- Bloomfield, L. (1962). *The Menominee Language*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gerlach, B. (2001). *Clitics: Between Syntax and Lexicon*. PhD thesis, University of Düsseldorf.
- Weiss, H. (1998). *Syntax des Bayerischen*. Niemeyer.
- Woolford, E. (2003). Clitics and agreement in competition: Ergative cross-referencing patterns. In Carpenter, A. C., Coetzee, A. W., and de Lacy, P., editors, *Papers in Optimality Theory II*, volume 26 of *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers*.