Multiple valuation, syncretism, and morphosyntactic "repairs"*

Bronwyn M. Bjorkman (Queen's University)
bronwyn.bjorkman@queensu.ca

University of Victoria, December 3, 2021

1 Introduction

Syntax sometimes imposes **conflicting morphological requirements**.

- For example, in **French**, ATB extraction of a third-person object clitic is ungrammatical if the verbs in the two conjuncts require objects with different morphological case (Kayne 1975: ch. 2):

(1) French: conflict between ACC and DAT

a. J'ai serrée **Hélène** dans mes bras et donné un baiser **á Thérèse**.
I=have hugged H. in my arms and given a kiss to T.
"I hugged Hélène and kissed Thérèse."

b. *Je { l' / lui } ai serrée _ dans mes bras et donné un baiser _.
I 3SG.ACC / 3SG.DAT have hugged in my arms and given a kiss
Intended: "I have hugged her and given her a kiss."

Linguists have often proposed that such conflicts can be **resolved** in various ways:

- Realize the **last** / **highest** imposed requirement:

(2) Niuean: conflict between **ergative** and **absolutive** (Bejar and Massam 1999: 72)

a. Teitei ke fakatau [e Sione] taha fale.
nearly SUBJ buy [ERG Sione] one house
"It nearly happened that Sione bought a house."

b. Teitei [a Sione]$_1$ ke fakatau t$_1$ taha fale.
nearly [ABS Sione] SUBJ buy one house
"Sione nearly bought a house." (movement from ERG to ABS position)

*Thanks to the audiences of the NYU Syntax Brown Bag, the 2021 Princeton Symposium on Syntactic Theory, the 2021 Canadian Linguistics Association, and a research seminar at UBC for comments and questions, and to Jim Wood for helpful feedback and discussion.

- Realize the requirement imposed by the **closest** element:

(3) German agreement with disjoined subjects (Smith et al. 2018: 469)

a. Entweder [wir oder ihr] seid/*sind gekommen.
either we or you.PL be.**2pl**/*be.1PL come.PTCP
"Either we or you came."

b. Entweder [ihr oder wir] sind/*seid gekommen.
either you.PL or we be.**1pl**/be.2PL come.PTCP
"Either you or we came."

But sometimes, as in (1), no resolution is possible.

. . . except, surprisingly often, when the conflicting features can be realized by a single **syncretic** form!

- Again in French: first and second person clitics don't distinguish ACC and DAT case.
- With such clitics, ATB extraction is suddenly possible, even though the syntactic context is otherwise the same as in (1):

(4) French: conflict of ACC vs. DAT resolved by case syncretism in 1 & 2 person clitics

Elle m' a serrée dans ses bras et donné un baiser.
She 1SG.ACC/DAT has hugged in her arms and given a kiss
"She hugged me and gave me a kiss."

Why is this a puzzle?

- The contrast in grammaticality between (1) and (4) is easy to state, but tricky to implement.
- This is especially true if languages allow multiple ways of dealing with apparent multiple valuation.

Plan for today

§**3:** The theoretical puzzle in context

§**2:** A survey of conflict resolution via syncretism

§**4:** Towards a proposal

2 Resolution-via-syncretism across languages

> **Question:** How common is resolution-via-syncretism, and in what types of contexts does it arise?

Most of the theoretical literature on resolution-via-syncretism focuses on a small handful of cases:

- German Free Relatives (Groos and van Riemsdijk, 1981)
- Polish ATB extraction in WH-questions (Dyła, 1984; Citko, 2005)
- French ATB extraction of clitics (Zaenen and Karttunen, 1984)
- Right Node Raising in languages including German and Russian (Zaenen and Karttunen, 1984; Asarina, 2011)

These all involve case syncretisms, and all arise in Indo-European languages.

- Is resolution-via-syncretism a case effect?

Not **only**: A more comprehensive survey

Current project: looking for more examples like this.

Some caveats on the search for examples:

- Avoiding examples involving agreement with conjoined / disjoined NPs
  - → disagreement on structure, whether these involve syntactic Agree, etc.
- With that restriction, all examples so far come from 2 language families:
  - Uralic + Indo-European (Germanic, Romance, Slavic) (+ maybe Pama-Nyungan)
  - If you know of others, please tell me! (If you find them later, please email me!)

- Note on Yidiny: Included as a possible example. The language has a person-based ergativity split (third persons are ERG/ABS; first and second persons are NOM/ACC). Though the language shows syntactic ergativity elsewhere (regardless of person), coordinated clauses can share a subject of the same case (ABSfor third persons, NOMfor first and second).
- Coon and Keine (2020) apply a similar lens to German copular clause agreement restrictions.
- Kouneli and Kushnir (2021) suggest that a restriction on clitic doubling in Greek (no doubling of plural datives) arises because of lack of syncretism—syncretism repairs all other instances of clitic doubling.

LANGUAGE[1]	STRUCTURE	POINT OF CONFLICT	FEATURE	RESOLVED BY
French	ATB (VP)	clitic	case (ACC VS DAT)	1 & 2 clitics
English	*go-get*	main V	INFL (various)	bare form
German	free relatives	rel. pronoun	case (NOM VS ACC)	inan. *was*
	RNR	N	case (ACC VS. DAT)	(various)
Icelandic	DAT-NOM clauses	agreement	φ-agr (3SG vs others)	agr. = 3SG
Norwegian	Topic.	top. pronoun	case (NOM VS ACC)	NP, 3SG, 2PL
Polish	ATB	*Wh*-word	case (various)	(various)
	free relatives	rel. pronoun	case (various)	(various)
Russian	ATB	*Wh*-word	case (various)	(various)
	RNR	N	case (various)	(various)
Hungarian	Topic. & *Wh*	finite V	φ-agr (OBJ VS INDEF)	1SG.PAST, 1PL.COND
Finnish	RNR	RNR-ed bare N	case & num (NOM.PL VS. GEN.SG)	possessed N
Yidiny (?)	ATB	N	case	*see note*

Table 1: Partial overview of resolution-via-syncretism

Remainder of this section: reviewing some illustrative case studies.

2.1 German Free Relatives

Groos and van Riemsdijk (1981) illustrate a **case matching effect** in German free relatives—perhaps the best known resolution-via-syncretism phenomenon in syntax

[1]Sources for each language: French: Kayne (1975) (Citko 2005 mentions similar facts for Italian clitics in a footnote); English: Bjorkman (2016); German free relatives: Groos and van Riemsdijk (1981), see also Vogel (2002), Bergsma (2019); German RNR: Zaenen and Karttunen (1984); Icelandic, Schütze (2003) (citing Sigurðsson 1996 and Sigurðsson 2000), Coon and Keine (2020); Norwegian: Taraldsen (1981); Polish ATB in *Wh*-questions: Dyła (1984), Citko (2005); Polish free relatives: Levy and Pollard (2002); Russian RNR: Asarina (2011); Hungarian: Szamosi (1976); Finnish: Zaenen and Karttunen (1984); Yidiny: Frazier (2012).

- Original observation: the case assigned to a relative pronoun *within* a free relative must be the same as the case assigned to the relative clause as a whole.

(5) a. Ich nehme, wen du mir empehlst.
I take who.ACC you me recommend.
"I take whomever you recommend to me."
b. *Ich nehme, wer / wen einen guten Eindruck macht.
I take who.NOM / who.ACC a good impression makes.
"I take whoever makes a good impression."

- Apparent case mismatches are rescued, however, if the relative pronoun is *was* ('what'), which is **syncretic** for nominative and accusative:

(6) Ich habe gegessen was noch übrig war.
I have eaten what.NOM/ACC still left was
"I ate what was left." (Groos and van Riemsdijk, 1981)

- Vogel (2002): for some speakers, case mismatches are possible if the case *within* the relative clause is **more "complex"** than the case external to the relative clause, and the relative pronoun bears the more complex case.

  Bergsma (2019) develops an analysis of these facts in Nanosyntax, using **?**'s case hierarchy → notably this will not extend to patterns in other languages

(7) a. Ich lade ein, wem auch Maria vertraut.
I invite$_{\rightarrow ACC}$ who.DAT also Maria trusts$_{\rightarrow DAT}$
"I invite whoever Maria also trusts."
b. *Ich lade ein, wen auch Maria vertraut.
I invite$_{\rightarrow ACC}$ who.ACC also Maria trusts$_{\rightarrow DAT}$
"I invite whoever Maria also trusts." (Vogel 2002: 344)

- However, Vogel notes that the resolution-via-syncretism for NOM/ACCis more stable across speakers than mismatches like the one in (7).

2.2 Hungarian: mismatches in agreement paradigms

Szamosi (1976) presents a case of resolution-via-syncretism in Hungarian as a "surface structure constraint" on wellformedness.

This pattern involves an interaction between verbal agreement (sensitive to the presence and properties of a verbal complement) and ***Wh*-movement**.

Basics of verbal agreement in Hungarian:

- The form of subject agreement is affected by the presence of a "definite" object.
  - **Subjective** agreement (traditionally *indefinite* agreement) on intransitive verbs and on transitive verbs with indefinite objects, as in (8a).
  - **Objective** agreement (traditionally *definite* agreement) on transitive verbs with definite third-person objects, as in (8b)—analyzed as showing agreement with the object as well as with the subject.

(8) a. Lát-ok / *lát-om egy fiút.
see-1SG.SBJ / see-1SG.OBJ a boy.ACC
"I see a boy."

b. Lát-om / *lát-ok a fiút.
see-1SG.OBJ / see-1SG.SBJ the boy.ACC
"I see the boy." (Bartos 1997: 365)

- "Definiteness" is not quite the right distinction: first- and second-person objects do not trigger object agreement.[2]

(9) Péter lát-∅ / *lát-ja engem / téged / minket / titiket.
Peter see-3SG.SBJ / see-3SG.OBJ me / you.SG.ACC / us / you.PL.ACC
"Peter sees me / you (SG) / us / you (PL)." (Bartos 1997: 368)

Two relevant complications:

1. CP complements introduced by the complementizer *hogy* trigger object agreement:

(10) János { akart-a / *akart-∅ }, hogy (el) hozz-ak egy könyvet.
John wanted-3SG.OBJ / wanted-3SG.SBJ that ASP bring-1SG.SBJ a book.ACC
"John wanted me to bring a book."

[2]The exception is 1SG>2 contexts, where a special portmanteau object marker *-lak* is found, distinct from both subjective 1SG-*ok* and objective 1SG-*om*. For various syntactic and semantic analyses of the basis of "definiteness" agreement see Szabolcsi (1994), Bartos (1997), Kiss (2002), Coppock (2013), Bárány (2015) among others.

2. Accusative *Wh*-elements *mit* (interrogative) and *amit* (relative) "what" require subjective agreement on the verb (i.e. they don't trigger object agreement).

(11) a. Mit akart-∅ / *akart-a János?
What.ACC wanted-3SG.SBJ / *wanted-3SG.OBJ John
"What did John want?"
b. A könyv amit akart-∅ / *akart-a...
The book which.ACC wanted-3SG.SBJ / *wanted-3SG.OBJ...
"the book which they (SG) wanted"

The conflict: For some speakers, extraction out of a CP complement requires that the extracted phrase **match** the (in)definiteness of the matrix verb:

- With *akar* "want", which is definite because of its CP complement (12), extraction of *amit* (or *mit* in *Wh*-questions) is not possible for such speakers (13):

(12) Akart-a [hogy elhozz-am a könyvet]
want-3SG.OBJ that bring-1SG.OBJ the book.ACC
"They (SG) wanted me to bring the book."

(13) *A/Egy könyv amit akart-a, [hogy elhozz-ak...]
The/A book which.ACC wanted-3SG.OBJ that bring-1SG.SBJ
"The/A book which they (SG) wanted me to bring."

- Similarly, though Hungarian allows topicalization out of an embedded clause (14), such speakers prohibit topicalization of indefinite arguments if the matrix verb is definite (15):

(14) A könyvet akarta, [hogy elhozzam]
the book.ACC want.3SG.OBJ that bring.1SG.OBJ
"It was the book that they (SG) wanted me to bring."

(15) *Egy könyvet akarta, [hogy elhozzak]
a book.ACC want.3SG.OBJ that bring.1SG.SBJ
"It was a book that they (SG) wanted me to bring."

The resolution: *Wh*-moving or topicalizing an indefinite argument into a definite clause is rescued for such speakers if the matrix verb is **first person singular past** or **first person plural conditional**!

(16) A könyv amit akar-nánk, [hogy elhozz-on...]
the book.ACC which.ACC want-1PL.COND.{OBJ/SBJ} that bring-3SG.SUBJ.SBJ
"The book that we would want him to bring..."

(17) Egy könyvet akart-am [hogy elhozzon.]
A book.ACC wanted-1SG.{OBJ/SBJ} that bring.3SG.SBJ
"It was a book that I wanted him to bring."

Why?

- The first person singular past and the first person plural conditional are **coincidentally syncretic** for subjective and objective agreement.
- With these verb forms, the verb can simultaneously reflect the definiteness required by its clausal complement, **and** the indefiniteness required by the fronted DP.

Points to note: pattern involves cross-clausal movement, but the locus of conflict is inflectional agreement with the moving element, not the moving XP itself.

2.3 Finnish Right Node Raising

Zaenen and Karttunen (1984): Right Node Raising in Finnish allows resolution via syncretism in cases like (18):

(18) [He lukivat hänen uusimman __] ja [me hänen parhaat __]
They(PL) read 3SG.GEN newest.GEN.SG and we 3SG.GEN best.NOM.PL
kirjansa.
book.3SG.GEN.SG/NOM.PL
"They read their (SG) newest, and we their (SG) best, book/books."[3]

- What is shared by the conjoined clauses is just the noun—modifying adjectives are stranded in both conjuncts.
- 3SG possessive suffix *-nsa* obscures single-consonant case/number suffixes, because the single-consonant suffixes delete before the cluster [ns]:

kirja	book.NOM.SG	+ *-nsa*	= *kirja-nsa*	their.SG book(s)
kirja-n	book.GEN.SG	+ *-nsa*		
kirja-t	book.NOM.PL	+ *-nsa*		

- However, case/number of the noun is recoverable from the stranded adjectives:
  - *uusimman*: newest.GEN.SG/ *parhaat*: best.NOM.PL

Zaenen and Karttunen (1984) review other configurations where syncretism *fails* to resolve a case mismatch in Finnish, but all plausibly involve different structural positions for the "shared" argument.

[3] All Finnish examples are drawn from Zaenen and Karttunen (1984). Glosses have been clarified in some cases, and modified to remove gender from translations of the third person singular pronoun *hän*. Free English translations disambiguate singular vs. plural *they* and *you*.

- For example: syncretism of *vaimoni* 'wife' for NOM and GEN fails to resolve conflict when modals *can* and *must* are coordinated—but oblique subjects (or deontic subjects) plausibly in a different base position in any event.

(19) a. Vaimoni voi siivota.
my.wife.NOM.SG can clean
"My wife can clean."
b. Vaimoni täytyy siivota.
my.wife.GEN.SG must clean
"My wife must clean."
c. *Vaimoni voi ja täytyy siivota.
my.wife.{NOM/GEN}.SG can and must clean
Intended: "My wife can and must clean."

- And in (20) RNR is impossible even though the object appears to have the **same** case in both clauses.

(20) a. Hän ihastui Kaliforniaan.
3SG fell.in.love with.California(ILLATIVE)
"They (SG) fell in love with Callifornia
b. Hän muutti Kaliforniaan.
3SG moved to.California(ILLATIVE)
"They (SG) moved to California."
c. *Hän ihastui ja muutii Kaliforniaan.
3SG fell.in.love and moved California.ILLATIVE
Intended: "She fell in love with and moved to California."

Points to note: the conflict-resolving syncretism in Finnish is plausibly not merely post-syntactic but **phonological**!

Cf. resolution of agreement with conjoined subjects in Xhosa, conflicts resolved by derived phonological identity (Voeltz 1971, Pullum and Zwicky 1986)

3 The theoretical puzzle, in context

Can the grammar "see" syncretism?

→ If it can, **how**?

What **could** syncretism look like, formally?

Consider syncretism of English *was* [wʌz] for 1SGVS 3SG.

Three potential representations:

1. The form [wʌz] is **ambiguous**: two distinct lexical items / morphological forms that are coincidentally homophonous.
   - *was*$_1$: PERS:[+author]
   - *was*$_2$: PERS:[−participant]
2. The form [wʌz] is **neutral** for person, and ***underspecified***
   - *you*: PERS: ∅
3. The form [wʌz] is **neutral** for person, and ***overspecified***
   - *was*: PERS: {[+ptcp, +auth], [−ptcp]}

Claim in the literature: only truly **neutral** forms, not those that are simply ambiguous, should be visible to grammar (Zaenen and Karttunen 1984; Ingria 1990; Dalrymple and Kaplan 2000; Dalrymple et al. 2009; Asarina 2011).

- Pullum and Zwicky (1986): while in many cases truly neutral forms are needed to resolve conflicts, in some cases ambiguity suffices.

Making morphological neutrality visible is hard within lexicalist models of (morpho-)syntax.

- This includes not only "classic" Minimalism (Chomsky, 1995, 2000, 2001) and its antecedents, but also constraint-based/feature-based models like Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG, Bresnan 2001) and Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG, Pollard and Sag 1994).

Lexicalist syntax: the units manipulated by syntax are lexical items. These lexical items contribute specific grammatical information (represented as features).

***Strong*(er) lexicalism:** The units manipulated by syntax are full words; syntax can neither build words, nor alter the morphological composition of words, nor "look inside" to see the composition of words. ← most LFG, HPSG

***Weak*(er) lexicalism:** The units manipulated by syntax are morphemes; syntax builds words via movement. ← "classic" Minimalism

The problem for neutrality in Minimalism:

- Syntactic representations are **fully specified**: because syntax is the input to semantic interpretation, all interpretively-relevant features must be specified even when their presence is not reflected morphologically (e.g. in English: irregular verbs, bare plurals)
- Syntactic representations are **consistent:** for the same reason, a syntactic head can't be specified for multiple values of a single feature—or at least cannot be specified for *conflicting* values of semantically interpreted features.

- Minimalism represents agreement / syntactic dependencies via **uninterpretable** features. All such features must be *checked* via a relationship with interpretable counterparts.

Neutral items are either underspecified or overspecified, so lexicalist versions of Minimalism seem to be pushed towards **ambiguity** as the only representational option for dealing with syncretism.

- . . . not that this question has received much airtime in Minimalism. It's gotten much more in the constraint-based syntactic tradition.

  Zaenen and Karttunen (1984): If resolution is *sometimes* possible, but not *always* possible, it must be that surface identical (i.e. syncretic) forms can reflect more than one type of underlying specification—at least sometimes reflect true **neutrality**.

  Ingria (1990): the existence of resolution via syncretism presents a problem if feature matching is done via **unification** (in constraint-based grammars)

  → proposed that feature matching involves not identity but a *non-distinctness check*.

  Dalrymple and Kaplan (2000): propose instead that feature values in syntax are potentially *sets* → feature matching requires memebership in the set.

That's interesting and all, but is it still relevant?

Most work in Minimalism now assumes a **realizational** model of morpho-syntax.

Distributed Morphology (DM, Halle and Marantz 1993, Harley and Noyer (1999), a.o.):

- **Derivational:** operations are *ordered*, and morphology as a component is post-syntactic (or part of the interface translating syntax into phonology)
- **Morpheme-based:** syntax builds words by concatenating elements; these elements are the units of morphological realization (whether heads, spans, or feature bundles)
- **Realizational:** morphology is determined by the features / elements being expressed, not responsible for adding those features.

Realizational morphology is what allows underspecification.

What does any of this have to do with neutrality and syncretism?

In DM, realization is determined by a principle of "best match": the Subset Principle.

- Realization rule (Vocabulary Item) that best matches the features being expressed, without specifying any features that aren't being expressed, is the one that applies.
- If no more specific rule applies, an "elsewhere" Vocabulary Item is inserted.

There is always a "best match", even if it's the elsewhere form!

In off-the-shelf DM, it should be impossible for **any** structure to be morphologically unrealizable!

→ no way for morphology to filter good syntactic structures, or fix bad ones.

Bjorkman (2016): Some syntactic representations trigger multiple applications of vocabulary insertion for a single position of exponence, each application involving a different set of features.

In these cases, all applications of vocabulary insertion must trigger the **same rule** (i.e. insert a neutral form), or the result is ungrammatical.

(See also Asarina 2011, Coon and Keine 2020)

4 Analyzing resolution-via-syncretism

The existence of feature conflicts, and the possibility of resolving them morphologically in at least some languages, requires at least two components in our theory of grammar:

1. In the syntax: a (constrained) way to cause a head to bear multiple values for a single feature.
2. In the morphology: a way to impose the requirements of multiple values for a single feature (without accidentally making all languages agglutinative)

When can a head get multiple features in the syntax?

In section 2's survey: always *uninterpretable* features. (case, φ-agreement, infl on V)

→ something that happens to **probes** when they get valued.

(In other words: nothing ever enters a derivation with a representation that will be subject to multiple realization.)

A more precise question: **When does a probe end up subject to multiple realization?**

- Bjorkman (2016): if a head enters Agree relations that give it conflicting values for any node in a feature geometry, the result is the creation of a second geometry
- Asarina (2011): in a multidominant structure
- Citko (2018): when a probe is valued by two targets *simultaneously* (Multiple Agree, Béjar and Rezac 2009)
- Coon and Keine (2020): when a single probe is valued by multiple targets (first target did not fully value the probe)

Common idea:

- Syntax doesn't care about having multiple geometries / values on a single head—just as it doesn't care about failing to find any value for a probe (Preminger, 2009)
- But morphology **does** care: when Vocabulary Insertion occurs, it is computed **once for each valuation of a single probe**
    - A single position can be realized only by a **single** VI rule, so conflicting feature geometries are grammatical only if they end up being realized by the same VI rule→true morphological neutrality, not accidental homophony.

Do the relevant multiple valuations all arise via one mechanism?

- φ-agreement: if anything is Agree, this probably is
- case: post-syntactic dependent case calculation
- verbal inflection: feature percolation / spreading

→ one **output** representation type

This gets resolution via **neutrality**, but not **ambiguity**!

Great! So what's the problem?

Languages seem to have other ways of dealing with "conflicting" features:

- Portmanteau agreement (note: exists in Hungarian for 1>2)
- Realize most marked case (Icelandic raising)
- Agglutination

4.1 Agree and Multiple Valuation

Recent work on Agree has multiple valuation all *over* the place—without conflict or need for resolution-via-syncretism.

- Influential proposals by Béjar and Rezac (2009) and **?** that an unsatisfied probe continues searching and can be valued by multiple goals.
- In most cases, the probe either realizes the **most specified goal**, or realizes **all goals** (via portmanteau or agglutination)

For example: Oxford (2019) develops a compelling account in these terms of Algonquian agreement, specifically Ojibwe (Anishinaabemowin).

- In **conjunct** agreement paradigms, there is a unique portmanteau realization for certain configurations where participants act on one another:

(21) waabaminagog
waabam -in -agogw
see -2OBJ -1SG→2PL
"I see you (PL)."

- Oxford argues convincingly that this portmanteau surfaces exactly where it does because a [uπ – uPROX] probe on T/Infl in conjunct clauses can be valued by both the subject and the object when these are equidistant from T/Infl.[4]
- He suggests that this happens because Ojibwe and other Algonquian languages happen to have a VI that references two independent sets of φ-features, otherwise the independent sets are realized via less-specified rules.

The same kind of pattern appears in Hungarian:

- all objective agreement is analyzed as portmanteau agreement with **both** subject and object, but there is also dedicated 1SG>2 agreement:

(22) Lát-lak téged / titeket.
see-1SG>2 you.SG.ACC / you.PL.ACC
"I see you (sg./pl.)." (Hungarian, Bárány 2015:104)

→ Do we have to somehow parameterize when multiple feature sets require parallel and matching VI, and when they don't?

An observation: Cases of portmanteau involve goals in different "grammatical roles"

Cases of resolution-via-syncretism involve goals in the **same** "grammatical role"

"Grammatical role" isn't a primitive in Minimalist syntax—available alternatives?

4.2 A very brief note on ambiguity

What about morpho**phonological** resolution of feature conflicts, as in Finnish and Xhosa?

- Is this—together with the existence of multiple resolution strategies—evidence for OT implementations of morphological realization in DM, fully parallel with phonology? (Rolle, 2020)

At this point, we have a very limited sample of cases where syncretism resolves feature conflicts.

[4]Crucially, Oxford argues that certain internal arguments move to Spec-VoiceP after agreeing with Voice.

Multiple paths towards resolution via syncretism?

- In **Morphology**: syntactically different, but inserted by the same VI so morphologically identical (and phonologically the same).
- In **Phonology**: syntactically and morphologically different, but phonology erases the difference.

We might expect **more** inter-speaker (and intra-speaker?) variation the **later** in the derivation resolution occurs.

- Interesting result from Asarina (2011): phonological ambiguity (identity created by regular phonological processes, from distinct morphological inputs) actually **better** than morphological ambiguity (coincidentally identical inputs).

Condition	**# accepted**	**# total**	**% accepted**
Fillers (grammatical)	191	261	73%
Fillers (ungrammatical)	52	235	22%
RNR, no case conflict	66	124	53%
Neutrality	41	62	66%
Neutrality controls	20	62	32%
Morphological ambiguity	27	62	44%
Morphological ambiguity controls	23	62	37%
Phonological ambiguity	32	62	52%
Phonological ambiguity controls	41	62	66%

Table 2: Results from Asarina (2011):184

5 Conclusions

There do appear to be genuine cases of resolution-via-syncretism in a number of languages.

→ too arbitrary to be plausibly syntactic

→ some systematically morphological, others perhaps phonological

To accommodate this in grammatical architecture:

- If you want to be syntactically lexicalist, more sophisticated representations and constraints on feature relations
- If realizational, morphology must be able to filter/rescue representations ← as can phonology?

This complicates theories of Multiple Valuation via Agree.

- Case-by-case parameterization, or distinct output representations?

And finally, a repeated entreaty!

- If you know of an example of resolution-via-syncretism in a language not spoken in Europe (ideally not Indo-European either), please let me know!

References

Asarina, Alevtina A. 2011. Case in Uyghur and beyond. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Bárány, András. 2015. Differential object marking in Hungarian and the morphosyntax of case and agreement. phdthesis, University of Cambridge.

Bartos, Huba. 1997. On 'subjective' and 'objective' agreement in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 363–384.

Bejar, Susana, and Diane Massam. 1999. Multiple case checking. *Syntax* 2:65–79.

Béjar, Susana, and Milan Rezac. 2009. Cyclic Agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:35–73.

Bergsma, Fenna. 2019. Mismatches in free relatives–grafting nanosyntactic trees. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 4.

Bjorkman, Bronwyn M. 2011. BE-ing Default: the Morphosyntax of Auxiliaries. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

Bjorkman, Bronwyn M. 2016. Go get, come see: motion verbs, morphological restrictions, and syncretism. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34:53–91.

Bjorkman, Bronwyn M., and Hedde Zeijlstra. 2019. Checking up on (ϕ-)agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50:527–569.

Bresnan, Joan. 2001. *Lexical-functional syntax*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honour of Howard Lasnik*, ed. Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–155. MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. Michael Kenstowicz. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Citko, Barbara. 2005. On the nature of merge: external merge, internal merge, and parallel merge. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:475–496.

Citko, Barbara. 2018. Complementizer agreement with coordinated subjects in Polish. *Glossa* 3.

Coon, Jessica, and Stefan Keine. 2020. Feature gluttony. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1–56.

Coppock, Elizabeth. 2013. A semantic solution to the problem of Hungarian object agreement. *Natural Language Semantics* 21:345–371.

Dalrymple, M., T.H. King, and L. Sadler. 2009. Indeterminacy by underspecification. *Journal of Linguistics* 45:31–68.

Dalrymple, Mary, and Ronald M. Kaplan. 2000. Feature indeterminacy and feature resolution. *Language* 76:759–798.

Dyła, Stefan. 1984. Across-the-board dependencies and case in Polish. *Linguistic inquiry* 701–705.

Frazier, Michael. 2012. Yidiny coordination reduction and syntactic ergativity. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 29: Papers from the Poster Session*. Coyote Working Papers in Linguistics.

Groos, Anneke, and Henk C. van Riemsdijk. 1981. Matching effects in free relatives: A parameter of core grammar. In *Theory of markedness in generative grammar*, 171–216. Scoula Normale Superiore, Pisa.

Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. In *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. Ken Hale and Samuel J. Keyser. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1994. Some key features of Distributed Morphology. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 21:275–288.

Harley, Heidi, and Rolf Noyer. 1999. Distributed morphology. *Glot International* 4:3–9.

Ingria, Robert JP. 1990. The limits of unification. In *28th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 194–204.

Kayne, Richard S. 1975. *French syntax: The transformational cycle*. MIT press.

Kiss, Katalin É. 2002. *The syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge University Press.

Kouneli, Maria, and Yuriy Kushnir. 2021. Failed clitic doubling of plural indirect objects in greek. Talk given at NELS 52 at the University of Rutgers.

Levy, Roger, and Carl Pollard. 2002. Coordination and neutralization in hpsg. In *The Proceedings of the 8th International Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar Conference,*, 221—234. CSLI Publications.

Oxford, Will. 2019. Inverse marking and multiple agree in Algonquin. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 37:955–996.

Pollard, Carl, and Ivan A Sag. 1994. *Head-driven phrase structure grammar*. University of Chicago Press.

Preminger, Omer. 2009. Failure to agree is not a failure: Agreement with post-verbal subjects in Hebrew. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 9:241–278.

Pullum, Geoffrey K., and Arnold M. Zwicky. 1986. Phonological resolution of syntactic feature conflict. *Language* 6:751–773.

Rolle, Nicholas. 2020. In support of an OT-DM model. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 38:201–259.

Schütze, Carson T. 2003. Syncretism and double agreement with Icelandic nominative objects. In *Festschrift for Christer Platzack*, ed. Lars-Olof Delsing, Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson, and Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson, volume 2, 295–303. Lund: Department of Scandinavian Languages, Lund University.

Siddiqi, Daniel. 2010. Distributed Morphology. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4:524–542.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1996. Icelandic finite verb agreement. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* .

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2000. The locus of case and agreement. Technical report, Working papers in Scandinavian syntax.

Smith, Peter W, Beata Moskal, Katharina Hartmann, and Zheng Shen. 2018. Feature conflicts, feature resolution, and the structure of either… or. *Jezikoslovlje* 19:457–480.

Stump, Gregory T. 2001. *Inflectional morphology: a theory of paradigm structure*. Cambridge University Press.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1994. The noun phrase. In *The syntactic structure of Hungarian*, ed. F. Kiefer and K. É. Kiss, volume 27, 179–274. New York: Academic Press.

Szamosi, Michael. 1976. On a surface structure constraint in Hungarian. In *Notes from the linguistic underground*, 409–425. Brill.

Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. 1981. Case-conflict in Norwegian topicalization. In *North East Linguistics Society*, volume 11, 377–398.

Voeltz, Erhard. 1971. Surface constraints and agreement resolution: Some evidence from Xhosa. *Studies in African Linguistics* 2:37–60.

Vogel, Ralf. 2002. Free relative constructions in OT syntax. In *Resolving conflicts in grammars: Optimality Theory in syntax, morphology, and phonology*, ed. Gisbert Fanselow and Caroline Féry, 119–162. Helmut Buske Verlag.

Zaenen, Annie, and Lauri Karttunen. 1984. Morphological non-distinctiveness and coordination. In *Eastern states conference on linguistics*, volume 1, 309–320.