

# Decomposing Number Features

John Gluckman

November 19, 2016

## Abstract

This paper is a study of the featural representation of nominal number. I argue for a reanalysis of how morphology represents number distinctions by arguing that languages do not make use of dedicated plural features (e.g., [+plural], Group, *etc*) (Noyer, 1992, 1998; Harley and Ritter, 2002; Cowper, 2005; Harbour, 2003a, 2008b). Instead, following Trommer (2006), number is dependent on multiple, privative, atomic features ([INDIVIDUAL]), essentially extending into morphology a standard semantic theory of nominal plurality. A feature bundle containing more than one [INDIVIDUAL] feature is mapped to a nonsingular exponent. The empirical discussion centers on agreement in LOCAL contexts, where a 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person acts on another 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person, and the resulting verbal agreement contains plural morphology. We show that the plural morphology is best explained by allowing a single syntactic head to copy phi-features from two different argument positions, “building” a plural feature bundle. I argue against the view in Trommer (2006) that post-syntactic mechanisms are need to derive the attested patterns, showing instead that they follow from independently motivated syntactic processes. Moreover, I argue that the analysis presented is in line with the semantics of plurality in a way that Trommer’s account does not cover. I extend the discussion beyond local agreement contexts, and show how this decompositional approach accounts for other contexts in which plural morphology appears in the presence of singular features. The proposed theory has implications for acquisition and morphological complexity, and it unifies morphological and semantic representations within a Minimalist framework.

## 1 Overview of the arguments

In this paper, I present a reanalysis of the featural representation of number. The prevailing view, essentially uncontested, is that number categories are represented by dedicated number features like  $\pm$ singular,  $\pm$ plural,  $(\pm)$ augmented, Minimal, Group, *etc* (Noyer, 1992, 1998; Harley and Ritter, 2002; Corbett, 2000; Harbour, 2003a), among others. I’ll argue that the features that underlie the morphological expression of number are “decompositional”, in much the same way that standard semantic theories treat number (Link, 1983; Schwarzschild, 1992). Non-singular morphology is the result of mapping a set of multiple “atomic” features to an exponent. In short, there are no number

features *per se*. I'll argue that such a reanalysis allows a simple and intuitive explanation for a range of diverse phenomena, in particular, cases where there appears to be a mismatch between the features introduced in the derivation, and the features expressed by the morphology.

The argument is built on the empirical domain of  $f\ 1\leftrightarrow 2$  effects, or LOCAL PERSON PORTMANTEAUX,<sup>1</sup> in verbal agreement—contexts where a 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person acts on another 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person (non-reflexively).<sup>2</sup> Such contexts have been described as “opaque and irregular” (Heath, 1998) with respect to the agreement morphology, since in many languages, unpredictable portmanteau forms are used in these contexts. This irregularity of  $1\leftrightarrow 2$  contexts—and in fact portmanteau agreement forms in general – have recently been analyzed within Minimalism as cases where the morphological component spells-out a feature bundle comprising features from distinct syntactic sources (Bobaljik and Branigan, 2006; Georgi, 2011, 2012; Woolford, 2012; Oxford, 2014). This view has been attractive as it attempts to reduce the fairly arbitrary mechanisms of morphology (proposed in, e.g., Noyer (1992); Harbour (2003a)) to a more systematic procedure of AGREE (Chomsky, 2000, 2001). Under the Agree view, a complex bundle of features is created when a single probe is able to copy features from (that is, agrees with) multiple, distinct arguments. The resulting bundle containing features from different sources is spelled-out as an irregular portmanteaux form. All of these analyses rely crucially on a Late Insertion model of spell-out (as in Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz, 1993)), where the syntactic component manipulates the features before they are shipped off to Spell-Out. While some languages exhibit portmanteaux agreement in all combinations of arguments, the most common context for irregularities in agreement occur in contexts involving a 1st or 2nd person acting (non-reflexively) on another 1st or 2nd person (Heath, 1991, 1998).

In fact, the “irregularity” of  $1\leftrightarrow 2$  contexts is subject to its own systematicity, and despite the characterization that “anything goes” in  $1\leftrightarrow 2$  contexts, there are straightforward generalizations as

<sup>1</sup>I use the term “portmanteau” loosely. Traditionally, “portmanteaux” are entirely opaque morphemes which combine the features of two distinct elements. Here, portmanteaux forms may be slightly transparent, or even homophonous with other morphemes.

<sup>2</sup>I use the convention where a rightward arrow ( $X\rightarrow Y$ ) indicates subject, X acting on object, Y. A double sided arrow ( $X\leftrightarrow Y$ ) represents both  $X\rightarrow Y$  and  $Y\rightarrow X$  contexts. The term “local” refers to speech-act participants, (1st and 2nd) person, which are local to the speech-act.

to what sort of agreement can appear on the verb in 1↔2 contexts.<sup>3</sup> I focus on a subset of cases in which the agreement morphology used in 1↔2 contexts is syncretic with what is otherwise a non-singular category, as exemplified by Nocte (Tibeto-Burman) in (1).<sup>4</sup>

- (1) a. *ni we-ik-e*  
 1pl read-PROG-1pl  
 ‘We are reading’ (Gupta, 1971, 17)
- b. *nga-ma nang hetho-e*  
 1sg-NOM 2sg teach-1>2  
 ‘I shall teach you’ (Gupta, 1971, 21)

In (1a), *-e* references a 1pl subject of an intransitive verb. In (1b), *-e* is used again when there is a 1sg subject acting on a 2sg object. Outside of 1↔2 contexts, there are no other syncretisms; the agreement is decided by appealing to a person hierarchy where 1>2>3. This type of syncretism is not confined to Nocte. It can be observed in a number of unrelated languages, to be discussed below.

The present paper will address two questions.

*Question 1* : What gives rise to 1↔2 effects? That is, why do we see “abnormalities” in agreement morphology in the presence of two local arguments?

*Question 2* : What gives rise to the syncretisms seen in 1↔2 contexts? Specifically, why do 1↔2 contexts syncretize with plural morphemes.

In response to the first question, I essentially adopt the analysis discussed earlier where 1↔2 contexts allow the creation of a feature bundle consisting of features from distinct features, which is consequently spelled-out (Bobaljik and Branigan, 2006; Georgi, 2011, 2012; Woolford, 2012; Oxford, 2014). That is, somehow the derivation contrives a way to get features from two syntactically distinct arguments into one feature bundle. I will argue that this is due to probe-RELATIVIZATION, coupled with certain assumptions about phi-features and the Agree relationship.

<sup>3</sup>See Liao (2010) for a discussion, as well as Heath (1991, 1998); Siewerska (2004).

<sup>4</sup>Examples are given in the orthographies used in the sources. I have simplified some of the glosses. Sources are given with the page number the example can be found on.

The response to the second question is the heart of the paper. Adopting a proposal from Trommer (2006), I will argue that the syncretism results from how we represent plurality from a featural perspective. Specifically, I will argue that plural morphology does not rely on features such as  $\pm$ plural, or Group, etc. Rather, plural morphology is built from atomic INDIVIDUAL features, parallel to a standard semantic analysis of plurality (Link, 1983; Schwarzschild, 1992). In other words, the feature bundle that is built in  $1 \leftrightarrow 2$  contexts is identical (enough) to a feature bundle which reflects a plural morpheme. Our proposal differs from that of Trommer (2006) in arguing that no additional assumptions are needed beyond the independently necessary processes of Agree decompositional number. That is, the output put of the syntax is realized as plural without additional post-syntactic processes. I will also address some further issues with the theory of morphological number that Trommer proposes.

This reanalysis of morphological features is important for a number of reasons. First, it argues directly against the proposals in Noyer (1992, 1998); Harbour (2003a, 2008b, 2014); Nevins (2011), where number is represented by maximally three bivalent features,  $[\pm$ singular],  $[\pm$ augmented], and  $[\pm$ group]. The proposal here improves on these analyses by correctly capturing the semantics of plurality, as well as foregoing stipulated post-syntactic operations on feature-bundles. Second, the decomposition of morphological number solves a number of difficult morphosyntactic issues, such as agreement with coordinated phrases, and  $\phi$ -features on bound pronominals. While I will not give in-depth discussion of the analysis of these phenomena, the proposal here maps straightforwardly onto existing accounts, simplifying greatly many longstanding issues. Third, I'll suggest that markedness theories might ultimately be traced back to more basic cognitive limitations. Higher number categories, like "septal" number, are typologically ruled out because of general limits on the cognition of sets of entities, following work within the cognitive sciences (Wynn, 1992; Malouf et al., 2015). As a corollary to this, the theory maps onto empirical evidence about the acquisition of numerosity, (Ramscar et al., 2011). Lastly, the analysis suggests a more transparent mapping between morphology and semantics, allowing a unified theory for both components of the grammar, in the spirit of – but crucially different from – Harbour (2008b). I understand this to be in line with a Minimalist view of grammar, as it seeks to reduce the number of representations required to

generate meaning and sound.

The paper is organized as follows. I first present the data §2. I'll then lay out my view of morphological number in §3, and my assumptions concerning the Agree mechanism in §5. I put everything together in §6. We'll then consider previous analyses of similar phenomena in §??, paying particular attention to Trommer (2006)'s Iconic Representation of Number. In §3, I present my proposal for how number is represented. In §8, I'll extend my featural analysis to other contexts, showing that there are a number of benefits. §10 wraps up.

## 2 A closer look at the data

As discussed in Heath (1991, 1998),<sup>5</sup> many languages display agreement irregularities in Local Contexts, sometimes using a portmanteaux form for one cell in the transitive paradigm. For instance, Ancash Quechua (Quechuan), as reported in (Lakämper and Wunderlich, 1998), uses the morpheme *-q* to express contexts where 1st acts on 2nd, while in other contexts, two morphemes are present.

- (2) a. 2→1

*rika-ma-nki*  
see-1obj-2  
'You see me'

- b. 3→1

*rika-ma-n*  
see-1obj-3  
'S/he sees me'

- c. 3→2

*rika-shu-nki*  
'see-2obj-2  
'S/he sees you'

---

<sup>5</sup>See also Lakämper and Wunderlich (1998); Noyer (1992); Cysouw (2003); Siewerska (2004); Trommer (2010); Bank et al. (2010); Georgi (2011, 2012); Řezáč (2011); Woolford (2012)

d. 1→2*rika-q*  
see-1subj/2obj

'I see you'

(Lakämper and Wunderlich, 1998, 121)

As *-q* is used to express the relationship of 1→2, it is typically assumed to be a portmanteau, spelling out the features of a 1st person subject and a 2nd person object in one morpheme. For convenience, I refer to such irregularities in Local Contexts as **Local Effects**.

Not all Local Effects have equivalent results. I will be mainly concerned with a subset of languages which display Local Effects, where instead of a unique morpheme, a form otherwise identical to (1st person) non-singular is employed in Local Contexts. Table 1 displays a collection of such languages.<sup>6</sup>

Table 1: Number syncretisms in Local Contexts

language	morpheme used when 1→2	use outside of 1→2	source
Nocte (Tibeto-Burman)	<i>-e</i>	1pl	(Gupta, 1971)
Karuk (Hokan)	<i>kín-/nú/nuʔ</i>	1pl	(Macaulay, 1992)
Yimas (Papuan)	<i>ka-mpa-n</i>	1sg-3dl-2/3sg	(Foley, 1991)
Wayampi (Tupí-Guaraní)	<i>oro=</i>	1pl.excl	(Jensen, 1990)
Mapudungun (S.A. isolate)	<i>-u/-iñ</i>	dl/pl	(Smeets, 2008)
Bolinao (Austronesian)	<i>=ta</i>	1dl	(Liao, 2010)
Tongva (Uto-Aztecan)	<i>re=</i>	1pl	(Pam Munro, p.c.)
Anindilyakwa (Australian)	<i>ngarra-</i>	1pl.incl	(Leeding, 1989)
Colloquial Ainu (Ishikari dialect)	<i>as-/an-</i>	1pl.excl/1pl.incl	(Shibatani, 1990)

I'll exemplify this pattern using data from two languages. First, consider again Nocte, repeated from above. The agreement pattern is given in Table 2, with the "exceptional" cells framed.

Outside of 1→2 contexts, the agreement morphology is entirely predictable by appealing to a person hierarchy, where 1>2>3 (cf, Silverstein (1976)). That is, given any two arguments of

<sup>6</sup>Table 1 is not exhaustive. These are the languages I feel confident enough in to report on. Moreover, some languages are representative of languages families, where syncretisms are prevalent (Tibeto-Burman, Austronesian). For additional languages, see Heath (1991, 1998); Liao (2010) and further examples in Trommer (2010). I also do not include Georgi (2011, 2012)'s examples of inclusive morphology, which should be also part of the pattern above. I discuss these briefly later. I also confine myself to Local Contexts where 1→2, although Local Effects do obtain in both directions in some languages.

Table 2: Nocte agreement (Gupta, 1971)

A <sub>1</sub> ,O→	1sg	1pl	2sg	2pl	3/intrans
1sg	-	-	<b>-e</b>	<b>-e</b>	-ang
1pl	-	-	<b>-e</b>	<b>-e</b>	<b>-e</b>
2sg	-ang	<b>-e</b>	-	-	-o
2pl	-ang	<b>-e</b>	-	-	-an
3	-ang	<b>-e</b>	-o	-an	∅

a transitive verb, the agreement morphology marks whichever argument outranks the other. So when there is a 1<sup>st</sup> singular argument and a 3<sup>rd</sup> singular or plural argument, only 1sg morphology appears on the verb; an **inverse** morpheme, *-h*, is used if the object outranks the subject.

## (3) Nocte (Tibeto-Burman)

- a. *nga -ma ate hetho -ang*  
 1sg -ERG 3sg teach -**1sg**  
 'I shall teach him' (Gupta, 1971, 21)

- b. *ate -ma nga -nang hetho -h -ang*  
 3sg -ERG 1sg -ACC teach -INV -**1sg**  
 'He shall teach me' (Gupta, 1971, 21)

If we reverse the order of the arguments in (3b), so that 3sg acts on 1sg, then the agreement is predicted by the person hierarchy: the 1<sup>st</sup> person argument wins, and the inverse morpheme appears. Likewise, when 2→1, the 1st person object wins, and the inverse morpheme appears.

- (4) *nang -ma nga hetho -h -ang*  
 2sg -ERG 1sg teach -INV -**1sg**  
 'You shall teach me' (Gupta, 1971, 21)

There are two things to keep in mind about the patterns so far: First, the hierarchy is entirely person-based, making reference only to person features. And second, “winning” the person hierarchy results in being able to reference *all* the  $\phi$ -features of the pronoun on the verb. In (4), because 1<sup>st</sup> outranks 2<sup>nd</sup>, both the person and number features of the 1<sup>st</sup> person argument appear on the verb in the form of *-ang*. Altering the number of either argument does not effect which argument “wins” the agreement slot.

The system diverges in 1→2 contexts. Given every other cell in the paradigm, we expect agreement with the 1st subject, but instead, the morpheme *-e* is used, as shown in (5b). *-e* otherwise appears to reference 1pl arguments, as in intransitives (5a).<sup>7</sup>

- (5) a. *ni we -ik -e*  
 1pl read -PROG -**1pl**  
 ‘We are reading’ (Gupta, 1971, 17)
- b. *nga -ma nang hetho -e*  
 1sg -NOM 2sg teach -**1→2**  
 ‘I shall teach you’ (Gupta, 1971, 21)

Thus, the appearance of *-e* when 1→2 is anomalous. Since 1<sup>st</sup> outranks 2<sup>nd</sup> elsewhere in the paradigm, we should expect *-ang* here as well. Moreover, unlike with Ancash Quechua, the morpheme that surfaces is syncretic with another cell in the paradigm: 1pl.

A more complex example is provided by Mapudungun, a South American isolate. Mapudungun employs a number suffix on the verb to mark agreement. Like Nocte, the number suffix tracks a 1>2>3 person hierarchy, reflecting whichever argument ranks higher. (“–” in the object column represents an intransitive verb.)<sup>8</sup>

Table 3: Number suffix reference in Mapudungun

Subject	Object	What number tracks
1	–	subj
1sg	2sg	<i>-u</i>
1	2	<i>-iñ</i> (if total ≥ 3)
1	3	subj
2	–	subj
2	1	obj
2	3	subj
3	–	subj
3	1	obj
3	2	obj
3	3	subj/obj

<sup>7</sup>Note that when 1pl→2 it’s unclear whether we’re seeing irregular morphology or the regular agreement. The analysis later suggest that this is technically a portmanteau as well.

<sup>8</sup>If both arguments are 3rd, then number tracks whichever is topicalized. See Baker (2003); Arnold (1994); Smeets (2008) (and references therein) for discussion of agreement and topicalization in Mapudungun.



However, as can be seen in the table, there is irregularity in Local Contexts. When 1sg→2sg, the morpheme associated with dual number (-*u*) is employed. In all other contexts where 1→2, the morpheme associated with plural number (-*iñ*) is employed.

(6) Mapudungun (South American)

- a. *kellu-e-y-u*  
help-IDO-IND-**dual**  
'I helped you (sg)'
- b. *kellu-w-y-iñ*  
help-1A-IND-**plural**  
'I helped you (dl/pl)' or 'we (dl/pl) helped you (sg/dl/pl)'

The descriptive generalization (observed by Smeets) is that when 1→2, the number suffix references *the combined total number of arguments of a transitive verb*. In all other contexts, the number suffix merely reflects the number of the argument which ranks highest on the person hierarchy.

Note that the same generalization that the agreement reflects the combined total of speech-act participants in Local Contexts is also descriptively true of Nocte, which only makes a singular/plural distinction. We could say that -*e* in 1→2 contexts is simply the feature set associated with *me and you*, a 1pl feature set. In fact, I'll propose in the analysis that follows that this is precisely what is happening in Nocte, Mapudungun, and all the languages in Table 1. The reason we see nonsingular morphology when 1→2 is because the morphology is spelling-out the combined feature set of the subject and object.

## 2.1 1↔2 effects, cross-linguistically

To give us a more general understanding of Local Effects, let's briefly examine all types of 1↔2 resolution. Heath (1991, 1998), in his survey, offers a list of the various ways in which 1↔2 contexts might be resolved.

(7) *Heath's strategies for dealing with 1↔2 marking (taken from Siewerska (2004, 237))*

- a. marker disguised by partial phonological distortion

- b. one of the two markers expressed by isolated suppletive allomorph
- c. one of the two markers (elsewhere non-zero) expressed by zero
- d. **number neutralization, sometimes including use of plural for semantic singular**
- e. **1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> marker merged with (or replaced by) 3<sup>rd</sup>-person marker**
- f. entire combination expressed by unanalyzable portmanteau
- g. entire combination expressed by zero (special case of portmanteau)
- h. **inclusive (+2) marker replaces 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> marker, or entire combination**
- i. **merged 1/2 marker is part of both 1↔2 and 2↔1 combination**
- j. subject and object markers compete for a single slot
- k. co-occurring 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> markers are widely separated
- l. combinations with identical segments differ in tone

The present paper will directly address only a subset (bolded) of these strategies, but the others are germane as well, and can be indirectly subsumed under the proposed analysis. In general, all these strategies can be grouped into the following patterns.<sup>9</sup>

- (8) i. both arguments realized normally
- ii. completely unanalyzable portmanteau form
- iii. partially unanalyzable portmanteau form<sup>10</sup>
- iv. one argument has a partially reduced feature set
- v. one argument has a fully reduced feature set
- vi. **combined feature set**

What is important to note about the list in (8) is that this is not an “anything goes” environment. We do not see insertion of random features, or periphrasis. In general, what we find is either opacity,

<sup>9</sup>See Liao (2010) for a similar list, as well as the discussions in (Heath, 1991, 1998; Noyer, 1992; Cysouw, 2003; Siewerska, 2004; Trommer, 2010; Bank et al., 2010; Georgi, 2011; Woolford, 2012; Georgi, 2012)

<sup>10</sup>This may be an affix which appears to display some recognizable parts, but also other unanalyzable parts.

impoverishment of a feature set, or a combination of features. That is, the apparent irregularity of Local Effects is only superficial, and the list in (8) now requires explanation—a task that will not be fully completed here; I will only address directly what gives rise to (8vi).

Nonetheless, recognizing that there is systematicity is important. We want to be able to give this variation a principled explanation, and the systematic nature of the patterns suggests that we can. Under a derivational, late insertion model of syntax and morphology, the only way the irregularities can be derived is by the interaction of the features of the subject and object. The agreement mechanism (whatever it is) must take into consideration *both* the subject and object in Local Contexts in order to make the appropriate morphological choice.

Given this interaction, and the assumption that morphology operates under a late insertion model of grammar (Halle and Marantz, 1993), there are two choices.

### 1. Conditioned allomorphy

One bundle’s features are altered by the presence of the features in another bundle (Noyer, 1992, 1998; Harbour, 2003a).

### 2. Portmanteaux

The features from both arguments are spelled-out as a single exponent (Bobaljik and Branigan, 2006; Georgi, 2011, 2012; Woolford, 2012; Oxford, 2014).

In ??, I critically examine the first choice, which has been the dominant analysis in the DM literature, particularly focusing on (Trommer, 2006)’s related approach to number which adopts this view. I’ll argue though, that the second option is the correct one, and I’ll assume such in section 4. More specifically, I’ll assume that the portmanteau analysis is the result of the agreement bundling the features of the subject and object into a single morphosyntactic unit on the verbal complex, as sketched in (9).

(9) [ ... Subject<sub>[+F]</sub> ... [ ... V<sub>[+E,+G]</sub> ... ] ... Object<sub>[+G]</sub> ]

Observe that the actual agreement mechanism is somewhat irrelevant. Every agreement model which assumes late insertion will need a method for “collecting”  $\phi$ -features into a morphosyntactically local configuration in order to derive the irregularities which are seen in Local Effects. Thus

a number of current models are sufficient for the present purposes, including movement of Agr nodes, Cyclic and Multiple Agree, where a single probe can agree with multiple arguments (Béjar, 2003; Řezáč, 2003; Anagnostopoulou, 2003; Nevins, 2011), and constraints on where and when person features are realized (Woolford, 2012). Any of these are compatible with the proposed theory of number—although of course each theory will have to be modified to accommodate different  $\phi$ -features.

That said, I will propose in section 5 a theory of agreement modeled on Cyclic Agree. As we will see, the theory not only captures the patterns of syncretism here, but also captures the more widespread pattern of Local Effects, i.e., why irregularities are so prevalent in Local Contexts. Moreover, it is equally well suited to explain instances of *interaction* between person and number categories in agreement, which are otherwise difficult to explain.

### 3 Decomposing morphological number

For the next few sections, I'll step away from the data to give an overview of my new proposed theory of number and my background assumptions concerning agreement. I introduce here the feature INDIVIDUAL (IND). This is a privative, atomic feature, which corresponds to a single atomic entity in the domain of discourse. In this way, a collection of IND features is a collection of individuals, and thus will correspond to non-singular.

- (10) a. [IND]  $\longleftrightarrow$  singular  
 b. [IND, IND]  $\longleftrightarrow$  plural (or dual)  
 c. [IND, IND, IND]  $\longleftrightarrow$  plural (or trial)

Nonsingular morphology will be spelled-out whenever *at least* two IND features are present. Some languages will map (10b) to dual morphology, and (10c) to plural or trial, etc. English, which differentiates only two numbers, has only the first two correspondences. This is not to say that there is a limit on the number of IND features that can appear in a bundle. Under the Subset Principle (Halle, 1997), a bundle containing two, ten, or 100 IND features will be subject to the

correspondence in (10b) in English.

IND features can be specified, or restricted, with other features, e.g., ANIMATE, MASCULINE, etc. In terms of person features, 3rd person is merely the presence of an IND feature: a single IND for 3sg, two for dual or plural, and so on. 1st and 2nd person categories employ PARTICIPANT (PART) and SPEAKER (SPKR).<sup>11</sup> Note that each IND feature in a bundle may be further specified. By contrastiveness, anything which is a speech-act participant, but not a speaker, will be second person (Cowper, 2005; Cowper and Hall, 2005). A language which makes use of two number and three person categories (like English) will have the following features specifications for its pronominal system.<sup>12</sup>

- (11) a. 1sg = "I"  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{IND} \\ \text{PART} \\ \text{SPKR} \end{array} \right]$       b. 2sg = "You (sg)" [IND]  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{IND} \\ \text{PART} \end{array} \right]$
- c. 3sg = "S/he"
- (12) a. 1pl = "We"  $\left[ \begin{array}{cc} \text{IND} & \text{IND} \\ \text{PART} & \\ \text{SPKR} & \end{array} \right]$       b. 2pl = "You (pl)"  $\left[ \begin{array}{cc} \text{IND} & \text{IND} \\ \text{PART} & \end{array} \right]$  [ IND IND ]
- c. 3pl = "They"

Observe that 3rd person is represented as the absence of person features, following Benveniste (1971), but not the absence of features entirely, since it will still contain one (or more) IND features. This points to a difference between IND and PART/SPKR. I assume that IND defines a *type* of feature, namely,  $\phi$ -features. But it is also "real" in the sense that each IND feature points to a unique individual in the discourse. Features like PART and SPKR designate *values* of IND. That is, 1st person singular is an individual which has the values of a speech-act participant and a speaker. Because of this dependence on an IND feature, a PART feature without IND is semantically uninterpretable.

<sup>11</sup>These features are based on Harley and Ritter (2002)'s feature geometries, but I refrain from using geometries to represent the relationships between the features to avoid confusion between a feature geometry and the lattice structure shown presently. The relationship between IND, PART, SPKR is one of entailment in the sense of a feature geometry, but the relationship between IND features is best viewed as a lattice.

<sup>12</sup>It may be possible to underspecify the 2nd person forms.

## (13) Semantically uninterpretable feature bundle

$$* \begin{bmatrix} \text{IND} \\ \text{PART} \\ \text{PART} \\ \text{SPKR} \end{bmatrix}$$

The bundle in (13) would refer to a single individual who is two speech-act participants, an incoherent concept.

The proposed system is meant to recapitulate in morphology the semantic notion that plural entities are constructed from atomic elements (Link, 1983; Schwarzschild, 1992). Taking for instance a Linkian representation of plurality, a group of individuals will correspond to a point in the lattice, and will also correspond to a phonological form (by the Subset Principle).




Figure 1: The correspondence between representation, sound, and meaning

Importantly, any group of individuals, say *Mary, Tom, and Bill*, has a semantic interpretation, as it will correspond to a point in the Hasse diagram in Figure 1, and it will have a phonological interpretation, as it will be mapped to an exponent, according to the Subset Principle. Under such a view of number morphology, there is no need to endow particular features with a particular semantics, as argued at length in Harbour (2003a), *et seq*; the  $\phi$ -features are a direct translation of the semantic theory.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup>Although it will not be relevant for the discussion below, I assume that properties can be predicated of IND features. For instance, [IND] combines with a property **chair**, yielding a single instance of a chair. *Chairs* would also minimally involve two IND features. The reader should keep in mind that the semantic analysis of plurality is extremely complex and controversial, and I will not make any deep semantic claims here, other than the assumption that there is a notion of “atomicity”, which is largely uncontroversial.

The proposed theory of number and  $\phi$ -features in general diverges from most previous theories in two important ways. First, *there are no number features*. That is, there is no morphological primitive representing “singular” or “nonsingular”. Second, *person and number are not distinct*. Traditionally, person and number categories utilize entirely different sets of features. In the proposed theory, it is impossible to specify the person features without also specifying the number features. Observe that this differentiates the present proposal from a closely related theory proposed in Trommer (2006), who also proposes that number features can be “atomized”, using  $\bullet$  to represent singular, and  $\bullet\bullet$  to represent non-singular, but employing additional features like  $\pm 1$ ,  $\pm 2$ ,  $\pm 3$  for person categories. While I concur with Trommer’s approach to number, I take the further step in linking the other features to the atomic features. I discuss Trommer’s theory in more detail in §??.

## 4 Portmanteaux and the realization of number

Assuming for the moment that (some) Local Effects are due the realization of portmanteaux, and the feature inventory proposed in section 3, then the plural morphology seen in Local Contexts follows naturally.

Consider Nocte again, where  $1 \rightarrow 2$  results in the morpheme  $-e$ , which is otherwise used to refer to 1pl arguments. Let’s first posit the correspondence in (14), which will realize verbal agreement with a 1pl argument.

$$(14) \quad \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \text{IND} & \text{IND} \\ & \text{PART} \\ & \text{SPKR} \end{array} \right] \longleftrightarrow -e$$

This bundle realizes two IND features, one of which is specified as a 1st person. Importantly, this same array of features results from combining the feature sets of a 1sg and 2sg argument, as shown in (15).

$$(15) \begin{bmatrix} \text{IND} & \text{IND} \\ \text{PART} & \text{PART} \\ & \text{SPKR} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{IND} \\ \text{PART} \\ \text{SPKR} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \text{IND} \\ \text{PART} \end{bmatrix}$$

Assuming that the bundle in (15) is built by the agreement mechanism, then the correspondence in (14) will apply under the Subset Principle. Thus, we explain the patterns of plural morphology appearing in Local Contexts as a consequence of the rules for spell-out.

Mapudungun is perhaps the clearest case. When 1sg→2sg, the dual morpheme *-u* is used on the verb. In all other contexts where 1→2, the plural morpheme *-iñ* is employed. Suppose the following two correspondences between features and phonological exponence.

$$(16) \text{ a. } \begin{bmatrix} \text{IND} \\ \text{IND} \\ \text{IND} \end{bmatrix} \longleftrightarrow -iñ$$

$$\text{ b. } \begin{bmatrix} \text{IND} \\ \text{IND} \end{bmatrix} \longleftrightarrow -u$$

The exponent in (16a) will be realized whenever there is a bundle containing three (or more) IND features. Crucially, such a bundle will be derived not only when there is a nonsingular, non-dual argument in the structure, but also anytime the features of three or more individuals are realized as a portmanteau. Since the resulting bundle will featurally resemble a dual argument when 1sg→2sg, then it will be expressed as such.

To recapitulate the analysis so far: The irregularities in Local Contexts are the result of interacting features from the subject and object. I made the (non-trivial) assumption that these were portmanteaux. The non-singular morphology seen in Local Contexts is explained by the fact that number morphology is decompositional, and plural feature bundles can be “built” by the agreement mechanism. The portmanteaux are sufficiently similar (via the Subset Principle) to the category of (1st person) non-singular to be realized by the same morpheme.



#### 4.1 Opaque portmanteaux and clusivity

The proposed analysis in fact covers contexts beyond those in Table 1. For instance, in languages like Ancash Quechua in which an opaque morpheme (-q) is used in Local Contexts, the realization of (15) will be simply that morpheme. Such an approach would essentially classify opaque Local Effects as the realization of inclusive morphology, since the feature specifications of (15) are those of an inclusive category, which is defined as a group including minimally the speaker and the addressee, i.e., two speech act participants, one of which is the speaker.

In fact, Georgi (2011, 2012) takes precisely this line of reasoning, and argues that “Local Person Portmanteaux” are *all* instances of inclusive morphology. Such an analysis is supported by a number of languages which exhibit an inclusive/exclusive distinction in the agreement paradigm, and choose the inclusive marker in Local Contexts. For instance, Surinam Carib (Cariban), as reported in Hoff (1968, 1995); Hoff and Kiban (2009), exhibits such a pattern.

Table 4: Transitive agreement in Surinam Carib

	1	2	12	3
1		k		s
2	k			m
12				kis
3	y	ay	k	n

The segment *-k* systematically occurs whenever there are two local persons in the derivation. In Georgi’s analysis, this results from a probe on T agreeing with both arguments, and building a portmanteau – similar to what will be proposed later. The resulting bundle, since it contains the features of 1st person and 2nd person, is functionally equivalent to an inclusive.

Observe, though, that Georgi’s inclusive analysis does not easily extend to the data from Nocte and Mapundungun (or any of the languages in Table 1). In order for her analysis to capture the patterns here, we would either have to say that *-e* always realizes an inclusive 1pl, or that there are two, homophonous 1pl morphemes, one of which is an inclusive 1pl, and another which is ambiguous as to clusivity. Clearly neither of these solutions is ideal.

Moreover, there are actually languages which make an inclusive/exclusive distinction in the agreement paradigm, but choose the *exclusive* form in Local Contexts. Wayampi (Tupí-Guaraní) is one such language.

(17) Wayampi (Tupí-Guaraní)

- a. *tataterno rape* oro- *inũ remẽ*  
 airplane path 1.EXCL- make when  
 ‘When we made the airstrip’ (Jensen, 1990, 135)
- b. oro- *esa remẽ*  
 1:2sg- meet when  
 ‘When I meet you(sg)’ (Jensen, 1990, 135)

This cannot be captured with Georgi’s assumption about number features without further stipulating processes that can affect the content of the feature bundles—a subject to which I turn in §??.<sup>14</sup>

## 5 Building feature bundles in syntax: Agreement

So far I’ve assumed that the portmanteaux features bundles are a result of syntactic operations. Let me lay out the mechanism that derives this assumption. The intuitive idea behind the agreement system here is that verbal predicates need to be saturated by arguments, i.e., individuals in the discourse. Furthermore, some languages have stricter requirements about what kind of individual the verb is looking for, that is, whether the individual is 1st, 2nd, or 3rd person.

More formally, following Chomsky (2000, 2001), agreement is a formal syntactic relation—AGREE—between a probe bearing uninterpretable/unvalued features, and an argument bearing interpretable/valued features. Agree consists of two processes, MATCH and VALUE.<sup>15</sup> Match requires identity of *types* of features:  $\phi$ -features Match other  $\phi$ -features, *wh*-features Match *wh*-features, etc. Since Match is *type-identity* and IND defines a type, Match occurs when uninterpretable/unvalued

<sup>14</sup>Skipping ahead a little, in the analysis proposed in section 5, the data from Wayampi is accounted for by allowing parametric variation in the agreement process whether a second PART feature is copied into the feature bundle.

<sup>15</sup>See also Béjar (2003); Arregi and Nevins (2012); Bhatt and Walkow (2013); Marušič et al. (2015)

IND ( $u$ IND) locates interpretable/valued IND within some minimal syntactic domain.<sup>16</sup> Value is *feature-copying*, where the features of the goal get copied onto the probe, which checks and deactivates the relevant features on the probe. In its simplest form  $u$ IND on T Matches with IND on DP, and the probe’s feature is valued and spelled-out accordingly. I’ll assume that Value copies all the features of the goal onto the probe—not just those in correspondence. This assumption is subject to parametric variation and will be slightly revised later.<sup>17</sup> So a probe  $u$ IND which Values with a goal  $\begin{bmatrix} \text{IND} \\ \text{PART} \end{bmatrix}$ , will copy both the IND and PART feature to the probe, realizing 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement. Likewise, the same probe when it agrees with an argument bearing two IND features will copy both IND features to the probe that the result will be to realize nonsingular 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement.

Probes can be *relativized*, meaning that they can be further specified to look for certain types of individuals (Béjar, 2003; Řezáč, 2003; Nevins, 2011; Preminger, 2011). For instance, a probe like  $\begin{bmatrix} u\text{IND} \\ u\text{PART} \end{bmatrix}$  is relativized to agree with speech-act participants. By stipulation, in order for a relativized probe to Value any of its uninterpretable features, it must do more than Match; it must find a goal bearing at least one feature which is dependent on IND. So the probe just mentioned will fail to Value (i.e. copy) any features from a 3<sup>rd</sup> person argument, as 3<sup>rd</sup> person does not bear a PART feature. This formulation captures the idea that some arguments, namely those without 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person features, are “invisible” to agreement in many languages (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, 2006; Béjar and Řezáč, 2003).


Lastly, I adopt the idea that Agree can act “cyclically” (Béjar, 2003; Řezáč, 2003; Béjar and Řezáč, 2009). Schematized in (18), a probe situated on  $\nu$  acts in Merge order, probing the object first. If it fails to value its PART feature on an object (say, if the object is 3<sup>rd</sup> person), it is allowed to expand its search domain to include a specifier. (A dashed line represents successful Match and failed Value; a solid line represents successful Value.  $\Rightarrow$  indicates a feature that has been Valued on that cycle.)

<sup>16</sup>Here, I abstract away from what either “unvalued” or “uninterpretable” means, although see Pesetsky and Torrego (2007) for why these are not the same thing. For the discussion here, both terms are short-hand for “I am a feature which needs something done to me.”

<sup>17</sup>Deal (2015) uses the terms *satisfaction* (the features the probe is looking for) and *interaction* (the features the probe copies).

(18) a. Agree on first cycle

[successful Match and Value]




Step 1: Probe Matches with the object (*uIND* find *IND*).

Step 2: Probe Values with the object, copying object's features to the probe.

b. Agree on second cycle

[Successful Match on first cycle but failed Value; successful Match and Value on second cycle]



Step 1: Probe Matches with the object (*uIND* finds *IND*)

Step 2: Probe fails to Value with object; cycles upwards

Step 3: Probe Matches with the subject.

Step 4: Probe Values with the subject.

The crucial aspect here is that only Value can deactivate a  $uIND$  feature, thereby halting the probe process. Thus, even though Match is successful with the 3sg object in (18b), because there is nothing to Value any of the features on the probe,  $uIND$  remains active for a second cycle. Note that Value is dependent on Match. PART cannot be valued without there being type-identity first.

The mechanism proposed in this section will be elaborated with examples in the next few sections, and additionally the theory will be complicated slightly to deal with parametric variation. It should be noted, however, that there is nothing radical in the proposed agreement mechanism. The switch to a different feature system requires revisions to the conditions under which the various pieces apply, but the pieces of agreement themselves have been independently proposed.

## 6 Applying the analysis

I propose that for the languages discussed in this paper,  $\nu$  comes with a probe relativized as in (19).<sup>18</sup>

$$(19) \quad \begin{bmatrix} uIND & uIND \\ & uPART \\ & uSPKR \end{bmatrix}.$$

In Nocte, 1st person plurals will fully value the probe, and all else will leave the probe with unvalued features.<sup>19</sup> In only one configuration of features, when there is a 2nd object and 1st subject, will the probe be able to agree with both arguments.


(20) *nga-ma nang hetho -e*

‘I shall teach you (sg)’

[Match and Value on first cycle; Match and Value on second cycle]

<sup>18</sup>Despite the rather stipulatory nature of this probe, which appears to be specified to look for a 1pl argument, I suggest in fact that the probe is specified to look for *two individuals* (one of which is 1st person), as we would expect from a transitive verb. We could call this “probe bundling”, by analogy to Voice bundling (Pylkkänen, 2008).

<sup>19</sup>See Preminger (2011) for why (some) unvalued features will not lead to a crash.



Step 1: Probe Matches with object

Step 2: Probe Values with object, copying  $uIND$ ,  $uPART$ ; cycles upward

Step 3: Probe Matches with subject

Step 4: Probe Values with subject, copying  $uIND$ ,  $uPART$ ,  $uSPKR$  to the probe.

On the initial search,  $uIND$  and  $uPART$  on the probe are valued by the corresponding features of the 2sg object. The presence of the additional  $uIND$  initiates a second cycle, and the probe is able to agree again with the subject, copying  $IND$ ,  $PART$ , and  $SPKR$  to  $v$ . (As assumed above, successful

Value copies all the argument's features to the probe.) The resulting bundling,  $\begin{bmatrix} IND & IND \\ PART & PART \\ SPKR \end{bmatrix}$  is functionally equivalent to a 1st plural, as discussed earlier, and so will be realized by the correspondence in (21).


$$(21) \begin{bmatrix} IND & IND \\ PART \\ SPKR \end{bmatrix} \longleftrightarrow -e$$

This same bundle will be copied to the probe in  $1pl \leftrightarrow 3$  contexts.

(22) a. *ate-ma nang-nang hetho-h-e*

'He shall teach us'

[match and value with object]




Step 1: Probe Matches with object.

Step 2: Probe Values with object.

b. *no-ma ate-bang chien-t-e*

'We asked him'

[Match with object, but no value; Match and value with subject]



Step 1: Probe Matches with object.

Step 2: Probe fails to Value with object; cycles upward.

Step 3: Probe Matches with subject.

Step 4: Probe Values with subject.

In all cases in which there is 1pl argument, and in those cases where there is a 2nd object and 1st subject, the resulting bundle will be functionally identical, and subject to the rule in (21).


The opposite configuration, 2→1, will leave an unvalued [*uIND*] feature on the probe, but a second cycle will only be able to Match, not Value. In this context, second cycle agreement will fail to copy features, since feature-copying for relativized probes is dependent on PART/SPKR values being available on the probe.



(23) *nang -ma nga hetho -h -ang*

‘You shall teach me’

[Match and value on first cycle; Match and no Value on second cycle]



Step 1: Probe Matches with object

Step 2: Probe Values with object, copying features to Probe.

Step 3: Probe Matches with subject.

Step 4: Probe fails to Value with subject

This in effect recapitulates the arguments for Cyclic Agree: the specifications of the object are more prominent in a sense, in that they determine (more than the subject) how the agreement will be spelled out. This cyclic approach also captures the appearance of the inverse morpheme *-h*: it only appears when there is no subject agreement. We can assume that this is simply the spell-out of  $\nu$ , which is contextually determined based on how many cycles there have been.

The proposed system has a number of benefits: First, we can explain why irregularities in agreement are prevalent in Local Contexts. This is because of the probe relativization. Second, we can explain the “unidirectionality” of the irregularities: for the languages examined here, they only happen when  $1 \rightarrow 2$ , and not when  $2 \rightarrow 1$ . This is because of the locus of the probe (on  $\nu$ ) and the ability for agreement to act cyclically. Third, we can explain the various kinds of morphology

realized in Local Effects. Opaque portmanteaux, inclusive markers, and nonsingular morphology are all the result of realizing a bundle of features comprised of multiple IND features, and languages may vary as to how they realize this bundle. In some languages, it will be an opaque portmanteaux due to a highly specified rule of exponence. In some languages it will be an inclusive morpheme, because the bundle is featurally identical to an inclusive. And in some languages, it will be (1st person) plural, because of the Subset Principle.

## 6.1 Local bleeding

The system as such also explains a curious fact about many of the Local Effects: they are sensitive to the number of the object. Consider Karuk (Hokan). When 1→2sg, the morphology that surfaces is syncretic with whatever is used to reference 1pl subject agreement. However, if we alter the number of the object, then the Local Effects disappear, and the morphology associated with “normal” 2pl object agreement appears. I show the paradigm for Positive agreement in agreement in Table 5. The same pattern can be observed in all agreement paradigms (Optative and Negative moods) in Karuk. The framed cells are portmanteaux, and the bolded forms in the 2pl column are the morphemes of interest.


Table 5: Karuk agreement (Positive paradigm) (Macaulay, 1992)

A <sub>1</sub> ,O→	1sg	1pl	2sg	2pl	3sg/intrans	3pl
1sg	–	–	<b>nu<sup>ʔ</sup></b>	<b>ki-k<sup>ʔ</sup>...-ap</b>	ni-	ni-
1pl	–	–	<b>nu<sup>ʔ</sup></b>	<b>ki-k<sup>ʔ</sup>...-ap</b>	<b>nu<sup>ʔ</sup></b>	<b>nu<sup>ʔ</sup></b>
2sg	ná-	kín <sup>ʔ</sup>	–	–	∅-	∅-
2pl	kaná <sup>ʔ</sup>	kín <sup>ʔ</sup>	–	–	ku-	ku-
3sg	ná-	kín <sup>ʔ</sup>	?i...-ap	<b>ki-k<sup>ʔ</sup>...-ap</b>	?u-	?u-
3pl	kaná <sup>ʔ</sup>	kín <sup>ʔ</sup>	?i...-ap	<b>ki-k<sup>ʔ</sup>...-ap</b>	kun <sup>ʔ</sup>	kín <sup>ʔ</sup>

I call this *Local Bleeding* since the Local Effects appear to be bled when there is a 2nd plural object. The proposed analysis actually has a straightforward way to capture Local Bleeding. A plural object will value the second *u*IND feature on the probe. Thus, a second cycle will not be able to Match, despite the fact that it has a useable *u*SPKR.

(24) 1→2pl = *ki.k...ap*

[Match and Value on first cycle; no second cycle possible]



Step 1: Probe Matches with object

Step 2: Probe Values with object, copying IND, IND, and PART.

Even though the probe has an unused *uSPKR* feature, it cannot Value with the subject, because there is no *uIND* to Match.<sup>20</sup>

While Karuk display Local Bleeding, Nocte does not. I suggest that the difference is tied to what is allowed to be copied upon successful Value. In Karuk, any successful Value requires all the features of the argument to be copied onto the probe, checking as many features as possible. In Nocte, on the other hand, Value only copies the features which are in a direct relation. Such a difference corresponds to Preminger (2011)’s concept of “granularity” of agreement. Karuk-type probes are “coarse” in that they copy any and all  $\phi$ -features. Nocte-type probes are “fine-grained” in that they only copy the features which are in correspondence.<sup>21,22</sup>


<sup>20</sup>I’ll assume that for Karuk, as opposed to Nocte, the difference between subject and object agreement is reflected in the spell-out of the agreement morphemes themselves. This is essentially saying that while the inverse configuration in Nocte is marked with a dedicated inverse morpheme *-h*, the inverse configuration in Karuk is expressed in the form of the agreement.

<sup>21</sup>Note that this requires a slight modification to the derivation of Nocte given in the previous section. Nocte’s probe will not have an “extra” PART feature in Local Contexts. This has no effect on the analysis, as the bundle will still be realized as 1pl.

<sup>22</sup>Georgi (2012) in fact comes to a similar conclusion in her approach. In Georgi’s analysis Local Person Portmanteaux

(25) a. Coarse agreement: (Karuk, ...)

[Match and Value on first cycle deactivates all  $u$ IND; no second cycle is possible]





---

result from the copying of positive values of  $\phi$ -features. Some languages have set a parameter such that they will copy all the features of an argument (including negatively valued features) when the argument bears a positive value, while others only copy the positive values and nothing else.

## b. Fine-grained agreement: (Nocte, ...)

[Match and Value on first cycle leaves an active  $uIND$ ; Match and Value on second cycle]



To be clear, this does not solve the entirety of the agreement in Karuk. However, it does provide a manner for deriving *interactions* of person and number in agreement. That is, the importance of Local Bleeding is that the number specifications of the object seem to be “overriding” the person hierarchy effects, which are otherwise in effect in Karuk. Such interactions of  $\phi$ -features are difficult to derive in agreement, and in fact, a number of recent theories have expressly attempted to disassociate person and number in syntax (Taraldsen, 1995; Nevins, 2011; Preminger, 2011). Such a separation comes at a cost, however, as we now are unable to handle precisely the sort of situation that appears in Karuk, where the number features can determine the outcome of agreement in person-based agreement hierarchy.<sup>23</sup> Indeed, recent case-studies in agreement have proposed that

<sup>23</sup>Separated person and number probes are what Béjar (2003, 2008); Béjar and Řezáč (2009) claim in their discussion of agreement in Karuk. In their system,  $\phi$ -probes can be divided into  $\pi$ -probes for person and  $\omega$ -probes for number. In some languages, these  $\pi$ -probes and  $\omega$ -probes are located on different heads. In this way, they account for the fact that in a language like Erza Mordvinian (Uralic), the preferred controller of the number probe is the subject (because  $\omega$ -probe is located above the subject) while the preferred controller for the person probe is the object (because the  $\pi$ -probe is located on  $\nu$ ). However, in Karuk, because the object is the preferred controller for both number and person, they argue that both probes are hosted on the same head, but that each can still act separately. Given separate probes, we expect person features of one argument and number features of one argument to each be reflected on the verb. But that is not always the case. In some instances (namely, 1→2sg), the surface form does not clearly express the features of either argument, and what shows up is contingent on how both  $\omega$  and  $\pi$  are valued. In these contexts, what  $\pi$  agrees with is contingent on what  $\omega$  agrees

some languages have **composite probes**, where the probe bears both person and number features, and is allowed to value then at the “best match” target (Coon and Bale, 2014; Deal, 2015) (see also (van Urk, 2015)). The interaction of person and number is what is lost in an approach that completely dissociates person and number in agreement. Under the present proposal, however, person and number are not separate, and so are expected to interact to some degree, dependent on the other parameters of the agreement system.

## 7 Previous analyses of Local Effects

The various attempts to address Local Effects are almost all efforts to account for the “portmanteau” nature of the morphology. That is, the analyses are attempts to explain the fact that Local Contexts result in unanalyzable/unsegmentable portmanteau forms.

For instance, Heath (1991, 1998) describes Local Effects as essentially a result of pragmatics, claiming that local contexts are pragmatically marked, and speakers tend to obviate or avoid them entirely. While it may (or may not) be true that speakers tend to avoid local contexts, this does not in fact offer a clear explanation about the morphological systematicity observed in these situations. Nor in fact does it explain why there should be a morphological reflex at all. Whether transparent 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> morphology is used or not, a phrase expressing “I saw you” still *means* “I saw you”, and so it is unclear why a morphological change is better from a pragmatic point of view.

Perhaps the most straightforward way to deal with Local Effects is with a set of accidentally homophonous affixes. I illustrate with Nocte. Recall that the morpheme *-e* is used consistently with all unambiguous 1pl referents, and it also shows up in 1→2 contexts. The following two correspondences in (26) can be postulated. (There may be other features, e.g., [-sg], etc.)

$$(26) \quad \text{a.} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c} +1 \\ +\text{pl} \end{array} \right] \rightarrow e_1$$

---

with.

$$\text{b. } \begin{bmatrix} +1 \\ +\text{sg} \\ +2 \\ +\text{sg} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow e_2$$

There are a few reasons why this is not a suitable approach. First, it fails to capture why this precise syncretism occurs. That is, given the accidental syncretism story, we might expect Local Contexts to be accidentally syncretic with any category, e.g., 3pl or 2sg. The fact that there is a predominance for syncretism with a 1pl category is unexplained. Moreover, we'd have to posit the exact same accidental homophony across a number of different languages. This suggests that we're missing a generalization.

A more blunt argument against having two spell-out rules as in (26) relies on the fact that two [+sg] features is *intuitively* a plural entity. That is, we intuitively understand that two [+sg] features are equivalent to a plural, and, abstracting away from formalisms, it is not surprising that the two should be homophonous. The question is one of mechanics: how do we mechanically derive the plural morphology without attributing to the grammar "intuition"?

The presence of such morphological irregularities has been foundational in the development of DM, which takes these forms as evidence for post-syntactic operations that work on the feature bundles. In short, the syncretism that we see in the Local Effects discussed in this paper is taken as evidence that a bundle of features can be contextually "adjusted." That is, the reason we see syncretism is because some feature bundle has been transformed to look like another feature bundle.

What I consider to be the most fleshed-out theory of post-syntactic feature adjustment is Harbour (2003c, 2008a) *et seq.*<sup>24</sup> Harbour takes on the challenge using the complex data from Kiowa (Tanoan), motivating a process called "Feature Insertion", which works in conjunction with Impoverishment (i.e., Feature Deletion) to derive the surface patterns of agreement. (In fact, his rules are established mainly to account for Local Effects, specifically when there's a 1st person subject and a 2nd person internal argument.) In his system, there's an Impoverishment rule that first deletes

<sup>24</sup>But see also Noyer (1992, 1998, 2001).

the features of the subject in the context of a non-singular 1st subject (A=Agent) and 2nd indirect object (G=Goal), (27). Then there is a general well-formedness constraint that regulates against a feature bundle lacking number features, (28). In such cases, the unmarked feature is inserted.<sup>25</sup>

(27) *Impoverishment*

$\alpha F \rightarrow \emptyset / [A \text{ \_\_}] [G \text{ \_\_}]$  (Harbour, 2003b, 576)

(28) *Feature Insertion*

$\emptyset \rightarrow [-\text{singular}]$  (Harbour, 2003b, 562)

Adapting this account into Nocte, we would say that when 1→2, the number features of the subject are deleted and then the subject feature bundle is subject to the rule in (28).<sup>26</sup> This would yield the correct morphology (allowing for an extra stipulation that only one feature bundle is spelled-out). But the question is the status of the feature deletion mechanism. This is a purely formal device to derive the surface patterns. In other words, such processes are simply a formal recapitulation of the surface patterns.

However, even if we can justify this sort of story, there are actually empirical problems when there is a more complex interaction. Consider Mapudungun again. Recall that when 1sg→2sg, dual morphology is used, and when 1→2, and the total number of participants is greater than 2, plural morphology is used. With Harbour's system, it doesn't seem possible to derive the correct pattern. Whenever 1→2 the Impoverishment rule will delete all the number features, and then Feature Insertion will insert [-singular]. That is, we should expect that in all contexts of 1→2 the result should be a general *plural* insertion, not sometimes dual and sometimes plural. Moreover, it's not clear how we could handle the inclusive distinctions discussed in subsection 4.1. Presumably a narrower set of Impoverishment/Insertion rules can be proposed to cover the data, but the more specific the stipulation, the higher the theoretical cost.

Trommer (2006), like Harbour, argues that 1↔2 effects are all post-syntactic in nature, and result from the ordering of insertion of vocabulary items and abstract markedness constraints. In this

<sup>25</sup>The complexities of Kiowa's number system are well beyond the scope of this paper. I merely discuss a small subset of the relevant data.

<sup>26</sup>Note that even in this theory, it is assumed that the agreement mechanism morphosyntactically localizes the features. Instead of being realized as a portmanteau, this local relationship triggers the adjustment rules.



way, the cross-linguistic presence of person hierarchies and Local Effects are somewhat epiphenomenal in that there is nothing built into the mechanism of agreement or spell-out which we can point to as the source of the portmanteau forms, apart from appeals to abstract notions of markedness. However, Trommer (2006) recognizes the importance of the syncretism in languages like Nocte, and proposes that number “features” are represented by “•”. Singular is [•] and nonsingular is [••]. The parallel to the proposal above should be clear.

Formally, one problem for this approach, as pointed out by Georgi (2011), is that it makes portmanteau allomorphy (and Local Effects) a non-local (in the morpho-syntactic sense) phenomenon. Without some mechanism for allowing the interaction of the features of the subject and object, the mechanism massively over-predicts here portmanteaux should appear, as any feature present in the syntax may trigger allomorphy of some other feature.

A more serious issue involves how he specifies his VIs. He relies on “suppressing” VIs, which are null morphemes spelled-out in the context of some feature. “I propose to shift perspective and to treat the phenomenon not as a competition process, but as direct suppression of features with lower prominence in the context of a head with higher-prominence features.” (Trommer, 2006, p. 223) For instance, he proposes the following VI.

(29) a.  $\emptyset \leftrightarrow [+2] / [-3]$

This VI operates (in an ordered list with others) so that 2nd person will be spelled out as null in the context of a non-3rd person. In this way, person hierarchy effects are the result of making sure that null morphology bleeds the insertion of more “default” morphology.<sup>27</sup> However, this system allows a VI such as in (30)

<sup>27</sup>The full set of VIs are given in (i). The brace notation ({} ) allows for a contextual trigger that may or may not be on the same head.

- (i) a.  $-h \leftrightarrow [-1 \text{ Nom}] / [-3 \text{ Acc}]$   
 b.  $-e \leftrightarrow [+1 \bullet] / \{-3 \bullet\}$   
 c.  $\emptyset \leftrightarrow [+3] / [-3]$   
 d.  $\emptyset \leftrightarrow [+2] / [-3]$   
 e.  $-an \leftrightarrow [+2 \bullet \bullet]$   
 f.  $-ang \leftrightarrow [+1]$   
 g.  $-o \leftrightarrow [+2]$   
 h.  $-a \leftrightarrow [+3]$

(30) a.  $\emptyset \leftrightarrow [-1] / [-2]$

This VI would suppress non-1st arguments (2nd/3rd) in the presence of non-2nd arguments (1st/3rd). Thus, we could potentially have a situation in which 1st is suppressed in the context of 3rd, giving rise to a  $3 > 1$  hierarchy. Such a hierarchy is unreported.<sup>28</sup>

I should note that the two theories of featural decomposition are distinct as well. Functionally,  $[\bullet]$  has the meaning “one and more”,  $[\bullet\bullet]$  means “two and more”, etc. He proposes an additional constraint (essentially an implicature for the morphology) that restricts  $[\bullet]$  to mean “one” when there’s something else that means “more than one”. Semantically, then,  $[\bullet]$  and [IND] have opposite meanings. [IND] means “one”—or more accurately, “is atomic,” while  $[\bullet]$  on its own means “one or more.” Moreover [IND IND] means “one or more,” while  $[\bullet\bullet]$  means strictly greater than one. The difference is important because, as pointed out by a number of authors, plurals include atomic elements, and do not mean strictly greater than two (Sauerland et al., 2005; Bale et al., 2011) among others. Thus, Trommer’s approach doesn’t actually align the semantic and morphological component.<sup>29</sup>

An explanation that is more in line with what I’ve proposed above is offered by Georgi (2011, 2012) as well as (Woolford, 2012). Although using different frameworks, both accounts argue that Local Effects are the result of spelling out a feature bundle which is comprised of the features of two distinct arguments. Starting with Woolford, she argues that (some) agreement portmanteaux are the result of post-syntactic alignment constraints, which require that all person features be aligned with the edge of the verb. Consider the tableau in Table 6, where the input consists of a 2nd person clitic, a 1st person agreement morpheme, and the verb stem. The constraint says “align local features with the left-edge of the verb”.<sup>30</sup>

The crucial VI is (ib), which expresses *-e* when  $[+1\bullet]$  are in the presence of  $[-3\bullet]$  on the same head, or when it’s on another head.

<sup>28</sup>Note that switching  $[-1]$  and  $[-2]$  in (30) (as it’s not clear to me which feature should have a lower prominence in terms of markedness) would not fix the matter, since then we’d expect  $3 > 2$ .

<sup>29</sup>An additional difference is that in the system proposed in this paper, there is an inherent connection between person and number, in that the former cannot be represented without the latter. This is not the case in Trommer’s system, where the person features are at least conceptually independent from the number features. Although I believe my proposal is supported in the data, I concede that more investigation is needed.

<sup>30</sup>Woolford argues that there are two ways to construct agreement portmanteaux. In the first way, agreement mechanisms in the syntax can build a features bundle. For all intents and purposes this is what I argue as well, although, with some basic differences which are outside the scope of this paper. The second way, outlined in the tableau in (6), post-syntactic

	2 <sup>nd</sup> Cl 1 <sup>st</sup> Agr verb	[local]→verb
☞	a. pormanteau-verb	
	b. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cl-1 <sup>st</sup> Agr-verb	*

Table 6: Woolford’s derivation for morphological portmanteau

The idea behind this analysis is that in order to satisfy the requirement that all the person features are aligned with the edge of the verb, a portmanteau form is used, which expresses (opaquely) both the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person features. The b. form in Table 6 loses because the 2<sup>nd</sup> person clitic violates the alignment constraint. As noted by Woolford, this analysis runs into difficulty when we consider that Local Effects are very often *unidirectional*. For instance, in Nocte, we see Local Effects when 1→2, but not when 2→1. An alignment analysis fails to capture this asymmetry, since both contexts should be expected to be subject to the constraint on person alignment. This can be overcome by creating constraints which make reference to grammatical function, but not without introducing additional complications, like whether the post-syntactic component is able to recognize a subject from an object.

However, even if Woolford’s arguments in favor of an alignment analysis are successful, we now have to deal with languages like Nocte and Karuk in which the “portmanteaux” form is syncretic with the form used for 1pl. The only thing Woolford can say here is that there is accidental homophony. The combination of 1st and 2nd person features results in a morpheme that happens to be syncretic with a morpheme that corresponds to a plural category. I addressed above why this is problematic.


Finally, Georgi (2011, 2012) offers an Agree-based account similar to my own. She proposes that a probe situated high in the structure can build a complex feature bundle by copying the phi-features from two distinct sources in the syntax. In her view, all opaque portmanteaux that arise in Local Contexts are essentially inclusive morphemes—morphemes expressing 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person. To derive this, she allows probes to “target only positive values of person features” (Georgi, 2011, p. 1).<sup>31</sup> (She assumes that only 1st and 2nd person have positive values of person features.) In

alignment constraints require a feature bundle to be built after syntax.

<sup>31</sup>I noted earlier that she also proposes that this may be parametric, so that some languages can copy all the features of

this way, a transitive verb with two local arguments will derive a complex feature bundle. In (31), a probe on T copies the positive [+1] feature from the subject and the positive [+2] feature from the object creating a bundle with [+1+2] bundle on T.

(31) Positive-feature copying (Georgi, 2011, p. 3)



She predicts that there should be a systematic syncretism between inclusive morphology and Local Effects, since [+1+2] is the feature specification for inclusive morphology. As noted above, this prediction is borne out in a number of languages, where the inclusive morpheme appears in Local Contexts. However, there are a number of problems with this approach as well. First, like Woolford, it is unclear how she can derive the unidirectionality seen in languages like Nocte. That is, if a probe can target the positive values of person features of the subject and object, why would one configuration of positive values (e.g., 1→2) result in 1↔2 effects, while the other (2→1) result in a non-portmanteau form? The second and third problems for Georgi have already been mentioned. First, there are languages that utilize the exclusive morpheme in Local Contexts. And second, she has no way of handling languages like Nocte, which uses a general 1pl morpheme, not 1 inclusive. She would have to postulate, like Woolford, an accidental syncretism.

In general, the proposal presented in this paper has the advantage of not only being mechanically simpler, since it forgoes the stipulated post-syntactic processes needed in traditional DM to an argument that is agreed with.

derive the patterns in favor of the processes of agreement which we need anyway, but it also is more “intuitive”, in that two singular arguments will automatically be realized as non-singular. Moreover, it proposes a systematic treatment for

## 8 Implications and Extensions

Reformulating number as morphologically decompositional allows us to capture a range of further data. Notably, whenever there is an apparent mismatch between the number features introduced in the syntax and the number features expressed in the morphology.

### 8.1 Resolved agreement

Consider first Resolved Agreement, in which coordinated phrases trigger agreement with a predicate. In (32), plural agreement on the verb reflects the semantic notion of a set of individuals, but, crucially, cannot be due to a plural feature on either of the arguments.


- (32) a. John and Mary are eating rice  
 b. *Juan y María comieron arroz*  
 Juan and Maria ate.3pl rice  
 ‘Juan and Maria ate rice’

English is rather a poor example of this phenomenon, considering the overall lack of verbal inflection, (32a), but languages which encode more on the verb also show plural agreement in these situations, e.g., Spanish, (32b).<sup>32</sup> Again, the form of the verb is intuitively plural given that the subject phrase is a plural entity, consisting of two people. But this does not explain why morphology should reflect a feature [+plural] when none has been merged in the derivation. Under the decompositional approach to morphological number proposed in this paper, the plural morphology

<sup>32</sup>Note that a default agreement approach in the context of coordinated subjects is difficult to maintain because languages still retain certain featural information, like person. Furthermore, languages which display further number distinctions, like dual, are sensitive to how many elements are coordinated. Thus, it is unlikely that  $\text{And}^0$  comes with a default [+plural] feature.

seen on the verb is derived straightforwardly via feature percolation, where the features of the two arguments are collected on AndP, which is what the verb agrees with.

(33) Coordination with feature percolation



The appearance of plural morphology is a natural consequence of coordination, rather than a stipulation about features.

## 8.2 Split-antecedent pronominal binding


Consider next split-antecedent pronominal binding. In these contexts, the bound pronoun is necessarily plural and in fact reflects the  $\phi$ -features of both of its (structurally independent) antecedents.

(34) {Each of the students}<sub>*i*</sub> told {each of the professors}<sub>*j*</sub> that their<sub>*i+j*</sub> meeting was fun. (Sudo, 2012, 178)

The relevant interpretation of (34) is the one in which the pronoun *their* has two (singular) antecedents, *each of the students* and *each of the professors*. In this type of partial binding, the plural number on the pronoun reflects the singular features on two syntactically distinct antecedents. That is, precisely as with Local Effects and Resolved Agreement, the features of two (syntactically distinct) arguments may be morphologically reflected in one place.

Adopting Sudo's more recent analysis, he argues that indices can be "enriched" with featural information, and so when a binder passes its index to the pronoun, the  $\phi$ -features come with it. A sketch of the idea behind this approach is represented in (35), taken from Sudo (2012), employing standard analyses for variable binding (cf. Heim and Kratzer (1998)).

(35) *Each of the students told each of the professors that their meeting was fun*



In (35), both of the binders contribute their  $\phi$ -featural information to the pronoun *their*, which then reflects the sum total of the features. That is,  $their_{8[sg],1[sg]}$ , containing two [sg] features, will be spelled out as plural. Crucially, neither argument provides a [pl] feature. Instead, it is the combination of features which results in plural morphology. Note that Sudo and Heim both take it as a given that two [sg] features might result in plural morphology. This is only true if morphological number is precisely as I have described it, namely, built from atomic features.

## 9 Typology and acquisition

Finally, what about the limits on morphology? If the proposal above is correct and morphology can “count” features, why are there no languages which contain a “septal” (7) or “decal” (10) number categories? The limit seems to be quadral number (groups of 4), which is exceedingly rare, if it exists at all (Corbett, 2000; Cysouw, 2011). I propose the answer to this lies within the innate limits on cognition. It has been recognized for some time that children are born with the innate ability

to compute small sets, containing one, two, or three elements (Wynn, 1992; Dehaene, 1997; Wynn et al., 2002).

“While young children’s numerical abilities are real, they are strictly limited to the most elementary of arithmetic. In the first place, their abilities for exact calculations do not seem to extend beyond the numbers 1, 2, 3, and perhaps 4. Whenever experiments involve sets of two or three objects, infants are found to discriminate them. However, only occasionally are they shown to differentiate three versus four. And never can a group of babies under one year of age distinguish four dots from five or even from six. Apparently, babies only have an accurate knowledge of the first few numbers.”  
(Dehaene, 1997, 56-57)

With respect to number morphology, a child could potentially be able to handle mapping a group of group two or three IND features to a phonological form, but because a set containing seven or ten IND features is outside the cognitive limits of the child-learner, no language will ever develop a septal or decal system.

Precisely such an approach has been implemented in Ramsar et al. (2011) *et seq*, which models the learning of number words in acquisition as an associative process. Moreover, a similar approach derives number Markedness (at least morphologically) quite naturally. As shown in Malouf et al. (2015), an associative computational model based on semantic information (i.e., sets) and real-world frequency information about number can derive Greenberg’s Universal 34, which states that there is no language with a plural without a singular, and no language with a dual without a plural, etc. Such an explanation goes beyond merely stipulating that UG contains a certain set of features, which any given language may or may not make use of.

## 10 Conclusion

The present study has argued for a reanalysis of the featural representation of morphological number. Focusing on a subset of languages within the empirical domain of Local Contexts, it was shown



that a surface (1st person) plural agreement marker used in Local Contexts is the result of realizing the  $\phi$ -featural content of both arguments. A theory of featural representation was proposed to account for the plural morphology in these contexts. The argument was that even though no plural entity was merged in the syntax, plural morphology can be expressed due to the fact that plural exponence does not rely on the availability of a dedicated plural features, rather it relies on the presence of more than one atomic IND feature. Data from a number of languages was provided to support the claim, including languages which exhibit inclusive and exclusive distinctions. The arguments were extended to other empirical domains, and it was shown that the approach here correctly accounts for phenomena outside of Local Contexts, such as agreement with coordinated subjects, and split-antecedent bound pronouns.

The proposed theory is in line with the Minimalist Program in that it reduces the language faculty to contain only those items which are essential for the computation of language, and nothing else. The same theory underlies both morphology and semantics. Note that this reduction in features does not entail an increase in computational complexity. Morphological spell-out functions precisely as before, with bundles of features being associated with phonological form. In this way, the decompositional view of number morphology is theoretically superior in that it merges semantic and morphological (and syntactic) theories.

## 11 Acknowledgments

I thank the following people for helpful discussions: Anoop Mahajan, Carson Schütze, Jessica Rett, Dave Embick, Jonathan Bobaljik, and Martin Walkow. I thank Pam Munro for provided me with data from Tongva. All errors and opinions are entirely my own.

## References

- Alexiadou, A. and Anagnostopoulou, E. (2006). From Hierarchies to Features: person splits and direct-inverse alternations. In Boeckx, C., editor, *Agreement Systems*. John Benjamins.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (2003). *The syntax of ditransitives: evidence from clitics*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Arnold, J. (1994). Inverse Voice Marking in Mapudungun. *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session Dedicated to the Contributions of Charles J. Fillmore*, pages 28–41.
- Arregi, K. and Nevins, A. (2012). *Morphotactics: Basque auxiliaries and the structure of spellout*, volume 86. Springer.
- Baker, M. (2003). On the Loci of Agreement: Inversion Constructions in Mapudungun. In *Proceedings of NELS 33*.
- Bale, A., Gagnon, M., and Khanjian, H. (2011). On the Relationship between Morphological and Semantic Markedness. *Morphology*, 21(2):197–221.
- Bank, S., Georgi, D., and Trommer, J., editors (2010). *2 in Agreement*, volume 88 of *Linguistische Arbeits Berichte*. Insitut für Linguistik Universität Leipzig.
- Béjar, S. (2003). *Phi-Syntax: A Theory of Agreement*. PhD thesis, University of Toronto.
- Béjar, S. (2008). Conditions on phi agree. In Harbour, D., Adger, D., and Béjar, S., editors, *Phi Theory: Phi features across Modules and Interfaces*, chapter 5, pages 130–154. Oxford University Press.

- Béjar, S. and Řezáč, M. (2003). Person Licensing the Derivation of PCC Effects. In *Selected papers from LSRL*. John Benjamins.
- Béjar, S. and Řezáč, M. (2009). Cyclic Agree. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 40(1):35–73.
- Benveniste, E. (1971). The Nature of Pronouns. In *Problems in General Linguistics*, pages 217–222. University of Miami Press.
- Bhatt, R. and Walkow, M. (2013). Locatin agreement in grammar: An argument from agreement in conjunctions. *Natural Language & Linguistics Theory*, 31(4):951–1013.
- Bliss, H. (2005). Constructing Dual Number in Hopi. In *Actes di Congrès Annuel de l'Association de Linguistique*.
- Bobaljik, J. D. and Branigan, P. (2006). Eccentric Agreement and Multiple Case Checking. In *Ergativity*, pages 47–77. Springer.
- Bobaljik, J. D., Nevins, A., and Sauerland, U. (2011). Preface: On the morphosemantics of agreement features. *Morphology*, 21:131–140.
- Buchler, I. and Freeze, R. (1966). The Distinctive Features of Pronominal Systems. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 8(8):78–105.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. In Martin, R., Michaels, D., and Uriagereka, J., editors, *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, pages 89–155. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by Phase. In Kenstowicz, M., editor, *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, pages 1–52. MIT press.
- Coon, J. and Bale, A. (2014). Interaction of person and number in Mi'gmaq. *Nordlyd, special issue on Features*, 40(1):85–101.
- Corbett, G. (2000). *Number*. Cambridge University Press.

- Corbett, G. (2010). Features: essential notions. In Kibort, A. and Corbett, G., editors, *Features: Perspectives on a Key Notion in Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Corbett, G. (2011). The Penumbra of Morphosyntactic Feature Systems. *Morphology*, 21:445–480.
- Cowper, E. (2004). Why Dual is Less Marked than Plural. In *Proceedings of NELS 34*, volume 34.1.
- Cowper, E. (2005). A Note on Number. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 36(3):441–445.
- Cowper, E. and Hall, D. C. (2005). Pieces of PI. In *Proceedings of the 2004 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*.
- Cysouw, M. (2003). *The Paradigmatic Structure of Person Marking*. Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistics Theory. Oxford University Press.
- Cysouw, M. (2011). The Expression of Person and Number: a typologist's perspective. *Morphology*, 21:419–443.
- Deal, A. R. (2015). Interaction and Satisfaction in  $\phi$ -Agreement. In Bui, T. and Ozyildiz, D., editors, *Proceedings of NELS 45*.
- Dehaene, S. (1997). *The Number Sense: How the mind creates mathematics*. Oxford University Press.
- Foley, W. A. (1991). *The Yimas Language of New Guinea*. Stanford University Press.
- Forchheimer, P. (1953). *The Category of Person in Language*. De Gruyter.
- Georgi, D. (2011). Local Person Portmanteaux and Hierarchy Effects: A unified approach. handout from NELS 42.
- Georgi, D. (2012). A Relativized Probing Approach to Person Encoding in Local Scenarios. *Linguistic Variation*, 2(218):153–210.
- Gupta, D. (1971). *An Introduction to the Nocte Language*. Northeast Frontier Agency.
- Halle, M. (1997). Distributed morphology: Impoverishment and fission. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 30: Papers at the Interface*. MITWPL.

- Halle, M. and Marantz, A. (1993). Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In Kenneth Hale, S. J. K., editor, *The View from Building 20*, volume 20, pages 111–176. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Harbour, D. (2003a). *Elements of Number Theory*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Harbour, D. (2003b). The Kiowa Case for Feature Insertion. *Natural Language & Linguistics Theory*, 21(3):543–578.
- Harbour, D. (2003c). Some outstanding problems of Yimas. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1001(1):125–136.
- Harbour, D. (2008a). Discontinuous Agreement and the Syntax-Morphology Interface. In Harbour, D., Adger, D., and Béjar, S., editors, *Phi Theory: Phi features across Modules and Interfaces*, chapter 7, pages 185–220. Oxford University Press.
- Harbour, D. (2008b). *Morphsemantic Number: From Kiowa noun classes to UG number features*. Springer.
- Harbour, D. (2011). Valence and Atomic Number. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 42(4):561–594.
- Harbour, D. (2014). Paucity, abundance, and the theory of number. *Language*, 90(1):185–229.
- Harley, H. and Ritter, E. (2002). Person and number in pronouns: A feature geometric analysis. *Language*, 78:482–526.
- Heath, J. (1991). Pragmatic Disguise in Pronominal-Affix Paradigms. In Plank, F., editor, *Paradigms: The Economy of Inflection*, volume 9 of *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heath, J. (1998). Skewing in 1 ↔ 2 pronominal combinations in native american languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 64(2):83–104.
- Heim, I. and Kratzer, A. (1998). *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Blackwell.

- Hoff, B. J. (1968). *The Carib Language: phonology, morphology, texts, and word index*. Martinus Nijhoff.
- Hoff, B. J. (1995). Configurationality and Nonconfigurationality in the Carib Language of Surinam. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 61(4):347–377.
- Hoff, B. J. and Kiban, R. (2009). Two Particles of the Carib Language of Surinam, with Their Nominal, Verbal, and Adjectival Properties. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 75(3):337–364.
- Jensen, C. (1990). Cross-referencing changes in some Tupí-Guaraní languages. *Amazonian linguistics: Studies in lowland South American languages*, pages 117–158.
- Lakämper, R. and Wunderlich, D. (1998). Person marking in quechua – A constraint-based minimalist analysis. *Lingua*, 105:113–148.
- Leeding, V. J. (1989). *Anindilyakwa Phonology and Morphology*. PhD thesis, University of Sydney.
- Liao, H. (2010). Morphosyntactic Irregularities in Local Pronouns in Some Western Austronesian Languages. handout from Workshop on Local Pronouns, Nijmegen, Netherlands.
- Link, G. (1983). The Logical Analysis of Plurals and Mass Terms: A lattice-theoretical approach. In Bäurle, R. and von Stechow, A., editors, *Meaning, Use, and Interpretation of Language*, pages 302–323. Walter de Gruyter.
- Macaulay, M. (1992). Inverse Marking in Karuk: The Function of the Suffix *-ap*. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 58(2):182–201.
- Malouf, R., Ackerman, F., and Seyfarth, S. (2015). Explaining the number hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual Cognitive Science Society Meeting*, pages 1500–1506.
- Marušič, F., Nevins, A., and Badecker, W. (2015). The Grammars of Conjunction Agreement in Slovenian. *Syntax*, 18(1):39–77.

- McGinnis, M. (2005). On Markedness Asymmetries in Person and Number. *Language*, 81(3):699–718.
- Mülhäuser, P. and Harré, R. (1990). *Pronouns and People: The linguistic construction of social and personal identity*. Basil Blackwell.
- Nevins, A. (2011). Multiple Agree with Clitics: Person Complementarity vs. Omnivorous Number. *Natural Language & Linguistics Theory*, 29(4):939–971.
- Noyer, R. (1998). Impoverishment Theory and Morphosyntactic Markedness. In *Morphology and its Relation to Phonology and Syntax*. CSLI Publications.
- Noyer, R. (2001). Clitic Sequences in Nunggubuyu and PF Convergence. *Natural Language & Linguistics Theory*, 19:751–826.
- Noyer, R. R. (1992). *Features, Positions and Affixes in Autonomous Morphological Structure*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Oxford, W. R. (2014). *Microparameters of agreement: A diachronic perspective on Algonquian verb inflection*. PhD thesis, University of Toronto.
- Pesetsky, D. and Torrego, E. (2007). The Syntax of Valuation and the Interpretability of Features. In Karimi, S., Samiiian, V., and Wilkins, W., editors, *Phrasal and clausal architecture: Syntactic derivation and interpretation*. John Benjamins.
- Preminger, O. (2011). *Agreement as a Fallible Operation*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Pylkkänen, L. (2008). *Introducing Arguments*. Number 49 in Linguistic Inquiry Monograph. MIT Press.
- Ramscar, M., Dye, M., Popick, H. M., and O'Donnell-McCarthy, F. (2011). The enigma of number: Why children find the meanings of even small number words hard to learn and how we can help them do better. *PLoS ONE*, 6(7).

- Řezáč, M. (2003). The Fine Structure of Cyclic Agree. *Syntax*, 6(2):156–182.
- Řezáč, M. (2011). *Phi-features and the Modular Architecture of Language*, volume 81 of *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Springer.
- Sauerland, U. (2003). A New Semantics for Number. In Young, R. and Zhou, Y., editors, *Proceeding of SALT XIII*, pages 258–275.
- Sauerland, U. (2008). On the Semantic Markedness of Phi-Features. In Harbour, D., Adger, D., and Béjar, S., editors, *Phi Theory: Phi features across Modules and Interfaces*, chapter 3, pages 57–82. Oxford University Press.
- Sauerland, U., Anderssen, J., and Yatsushiro, K. (2005). The Plural is Semantically Unmarked. *Linguistic Evidence*, pages 413–434.
- Schwarzschild, R. (1992). Types of Plural Individuals. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 15(6):641–675.
- Shibatani, M. (1990). *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge University Press.
- Siewerska, A. (2004). *Person*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge.
- Silverstein, M. (1976). Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity. In Dixon, R. M. W., editor, *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*. Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Smeets, I. (2008). *A Grammar of Mapuche*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sudo, Y. (2012). *On the Semantics of Phi Features on Pronouns*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Sudo, Y. (to appear). Person Features Are Not Presupposition Triggers. <http://web.mit.edu/ysudo/www/pdf/personfeatures3.pdf>.
- Taraldsen, K. (1995). On Agreement and Nominative Objects in Icelandic. In Hubert Haider, Susan Olsen, S. V., editor, *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, pages 307–327. Kluwer, Netherlands.



- Trommer, J. (2006). Plural Insertion is Constructed Plural. In Müller, G. and Trommer, J., editors, *Subanalysis of Argument Encoding in Distributed Morphology*, volume 84 of *Linguistische Arbeiten*. Universität Leipzig.
- Trommer, J. (2010). The Typology of Portmanteau Agreement. slides presented as DGfS-CNRS Summer School on Linguistic Typology.
- van Koppen, M. (2012). The Distribution of phi-features in Pronouns. *Natural Language & Linguistics Theory*, 30:135–177.
- van Urk, C. (2015). *A uniform syntax for phrasal movement: A case study of Dinka Bor*. PhD thesis, MIT.
- Wechsler, S. (2003). Number as person. In Bonami, O. and Hofherr, P. C., editors, *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics, papers from CSSP 2003*.
- Woolford, E. (2012). Two Types of Portmanteau Agreement: Syntactic and Morphological. In *Optimality Theory Workshop, Nov 9-10*.
- Wynn, K. (1992). Addition and subtraction by human infants. *Nature*, 358(6389):749–750.
- Wynn, K., Bloom, P., and Chi Chiang, W. (2002). Enumeration of collective entities by 5-month-old infants. *Cognition*, 83(3):B55–B62.