

**On constraining inter-modular reference:  
Nonconcatenative exponence in the Russian derived imperfective**  
Vera Griбанова, Stanford University

Most generative linguistic theories share the core idea that linguistic operations subdivide into distinct modules, within which specific types of representations and operations are permitted (Scheer, 2011). The idea that communication between these modules (at their interfaces) is limited to a narrow set of interactions serves as a major constraining factor in our theorizing. Analysis of morphological operations plays a key role in these discussions, since it requires us to formulate just how much access morphosyntactic and morphophonological representations may have to each other. The narrow question investigated in this talk is whether morphosyntactic information can be accessed once it has been realized phonologically. The maximally restrictive position, advocated for in various instantiations in Halle 1990; Inkelas 1989; Bobaljik 2000; Bermúdez-Otero 2012; Bye and Svenonius 2012, is that it cannot: phonological operations should not be able to access morphosyntactic features directly.

Of particular importance in this regard is the question of how we should understand instances of *nonconcatenative exponence*, in which phonological operations — e.g. umlaut, ablaut, reduplication, etc. — reflect specific morphosyntactic information. How do we translate morphosyntactic information into phonological representations in a maximally constrained way when the relation is not about the realization of segments, but about the application of a phonological operation? In this talk I investigate two such case studies, both of them involving realization of the Russian derived imperfective (DI). The canonical realization of the DI — which makes prefixed, perfective verbs (1,3,5) into imperfectives — is suffixal (2). However, in the case of certain verbs the DI suffix is accompanied by vowel mutation in the root (4), and in certain others the only reflection of DI features is the realization of a vowel in the root of the verb (6).

(1)      za-bol'-e-t' PFX-hurt-TH-INF 'to fall ill' (PFV)	(3)      za-moroz-i-t' PFX-freeze-TH-INF 'to freeze (sth.)' (PFV)	(5)      razo-sl-a-t' apart-send-TH-INF 'send out' (PFV)
(2)      za-bol'-e-v-a-t' PFX-hurt- <i>v</i> -DI-TH-INF 'to fall ill' (IMPF)	(4)      za-moraž-iv-a-t' PFX-freeze-DI-TH-INF 'to freeze (sth.)' (IMPF)	(6)      ras-syl-a-t' apart-send-TH-INF 'send out' (IMPF)

In a realizational theory like Distributed Morphology (DM), these interactions have been dealt with through the application of readjustment rules: phonological rules which apply in a listed set of morphosyntactic environments, after the matching of morphosyntactic features to their corresponding phonological exponents (Vocabulary Insertion, in DM). These rules have often been the source of concern for their unrestrictedness and potential to weaken the predictive power of DM (Siddiqi, 2006, 2009; Bye and Svenonius, 2012; Bermúdez-Otero, 2012; Haugen and Siddiqi, 2013). They further have the property of necessitating simultaneous reference to phonological and morphosyntactic information, requiring a significant departure from the maximally conservative position in which these modules interact with each other only at the point of lexical insertion (Bermúdez-Otero, 2012). To the extent that morphophonological analyses can eventually do away with readjustment rules, or at least significantly limit their power, the benefit to DM is apparent: it would become both more restrictive and more convincing.

I develop and compare two analyses of the alternations in (4) and (6): the first is a readjustment analysis, which I demonstrate requires simultaneous intermingling of morphosyntactic and phonological information that leads to a fairly unrestricted view of their interaction. I pursue an alternative *featural affixation* view, following Bye and Svenonius (2012) (among many others) and building on Griбанова To appear, in which the non-local phonological effects observed in (4) and (6) are best accounted for if morphosyntactic features

like the DI can be realized directly via the insertion of autosegmental material, sometimes in addition to segmental material. Cases like (6) involve the insertion of a floating mora, whereas cases like (4) involve the insertion of a suffix along with phonological features which force a change in the closest root vowel. I argue that this approach, modeled in an Optimality Theoretic framework, allows us to better characterize the locus of the morphosyntactically triggered phonological change, without requiring reference to morphosyntactic information in the process. The featural affixation approach thus results in a more constrained inter-modular interaction than a readjustment approach.

## References

- Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo. 2012. The architecture of grammar and the division of labour in exponence. In J. Trommer (Ed.), *The Morphology and Phonology of Exponence*, 8–83. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2000. The ins and outs of contextual allomorphy. In K. K. Grohmann and C. Struijke (Eds.), *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics, volume 10*, 35–71.
- Bye, Patrick, and Peter Svenonius. 2012. Non-concatenative morphology as epiphenomenon. In J. Trommer (Ed.), *The Morphology and Phonology of Exponence*, 427–495. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gribanova, Vera. To appear. Exponence and morphosyntactically triggered phonological processes in the Russian verbal complex. *Journal of Linguistics*.
- Halle, Morris. 1990. An approach to morphology. In *Proceedings of NELS 20*, 150–184, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. GLSA.
- Haugen, Jason, and Daniel Siddiqi. 2013. Roots and the derivation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44(3):493–517.
- Inkelas, Sharon. 1989. *Prosodic constituency in the lexicon*. PhD thesis, Stanford University.
- Scheer, Tobias. 2011. *A Guide to Morphosyntax-Phonology Interface Theories. How Extra-Phonological Information is Treated in Phonology since Trubetzkoy's Grenzsignale*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Siddiqi, Daniel. 2006. *Minimize exponence: economy effects on the morphosyntactic component of the grammar*. PhD thesis, University of Arizona.
- Siddiqi, Daniel. 2009. *Syntax within the Word: Economy, Allomorphy, and Argument Selection in Distributed Morphology*. John Benjamins.