

1. Modularity, Late Realization & Interpretation on PF and LF sides

Unit 1: Modularity in the Grammar

This unit introduces the model of the grammar adopted in our work, namely a postsyntactic morphological component that is the result of a split between PF and LF after the narrow syntax, with the traditional lexicon clefted into three separate lists: the formative list, providing the input to syntax, the exponent list, providing interpretation at PF, and the encyclopedic list, providing interpretation at LF. Issues such as roots vs affixes, late-realization, and context-sensitive interpretation will be discussed.

Readings:

- Nevins, Andrew. 2014. Ten lecture notes on Distributed Morphology.
- Arregi, Karlos, and Andrew Nevins. 2014. A monoradical approach to some cases of disuppletion: Commentary on Heidi Harley's 'On The Identity of Roots'. Submitted to *Theoretical Linguistics*.
- Barner, David and Alan Bale. 2002. No nouns, no verbs: psycholinguistic arguments in favor of lexical underspecification. *Lingua* 112: 771–791.

Unit 2: Syncretism and Defaults

This unit is dedicated to further exploring modularity in morphology, by taking a closer look at specific operations such as Vocabulary Insertion and impoverishment and their theoretical underpinnings. We'll review recent work on the relation between morphological markedness and syncretism, as formalized by markedness-triggered impoverishment in DM, as well as on the proper characterization and analysis of words with defective paradigms.

Readings:

- Chapter 4 of Arregi, Karlos, and Andrew Nevins. 2012. *Morphotactics: Basque auxiliaries and the structure of Spellout*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2011. Marked Targets versus marked triggers and impoverishment of the dual. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42:413–444.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2014. Book Review of "Defective Paradigms: Missing Forms and What they Tell Us." To appear in *Linguistica*.

2. Agreement, Clitics, and Features

Unit 3: Person and Case, Clitics

In this unit, we'll discuss the recent debate on the agreement vs. pronominal clitic distinction, and how it can be accounted for in the syntax. In particular, agreement is the morphological reflex of (some version) of Minimalist Agree, while cliticization is the result of movement of weak pronouns to inflectional heads in clause structure. Part of the discussion will center on how this analysis accounts for person and case-related constraints on cliticization (e.g. variation in subject cliticization in Romance), and will thus include discussion of the syntax and feature structure of person and case.

Readings:

- Chapter 2 of Arregi and Nevins 2012.
- Ackema, Peter, and Ad Neeleman. 2013. Person features and syncretism. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31:901-950.

Unit 4: Two-Step Agreement

This unit develops the theory of agreement as a two-step operation, with Agree-Link establishing the relation between probe and goal within the syntax, and Agree-Copy providing the morphological step of copying the values from goal to probe. The crucial evidence for a two-step agreement procedure comes from the fact that a number of demonstrably post-syntactic operations, such as Lowering and Impoverishment, can occur between the two, and hence derivationally feed/bleed the latter. Readings:

- Arregi, Karlos, and Andrew Nevins. 2014. Agree-Link, Derivational Sandwiching, and Agree-Copy. Ms., University of Chicago and University College London.

3. Linear and Hierarchical Morphotactics

Unit 5: Metathesis and Fission

This unit will concentrate on some of the most contentious postsyntactic operations used in DM and related frameworks: metathesis as well as other forms of postsyntactic movement, and fission, which splits a syntactic terminal nodes into two (or possibly more) positions of exponence. The discussion will center on the status of these phenomena as postsyntactic operations (including analyses that reject their existence), and will include a close look at the behavior of plural clitics in Basque.

Readings:

- Chapter 5 of Arregi and Nevins 2012.
- Kayne, Richard. 2010. Toward a syntactic reinterpretation of Harris & Halle (2005). In Reineke Bok-Bennema, Brigitte Kampers-Manhe, and Bart Hollebrandse (eds.) *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2008: Selected papers from 'Going Romance', Groningen, 2008*, 145–170. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Unit 6: New Phenomena in Morphotactics

In this unit we explore phenomena that provide evidence for the metathesis formalism in Unit 5 and specific morphotactic constraints, exploring very recent papers on these topics. Readings:

- Salzmann, Martin. 2013. Rule ordering in verb cluster formation. On the extraposition paradox and the placement of the infinitival particle *te/zu*. In Anke Assmann and Fabian Heck (eds.): *Rule Interaction in Grammar. Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 90*, University of Leipzig, 65-121.
- Smith, Peter. 2014. Non-peripheral cliticization and second position in Udi and Sorani Kurdish. Ms., University of Connecticut.
- Myler, Neil. 2013. Exceptions to the Mirror Principle and Morphophonological “action at a distance”: The role of “word”-internal Phrasal Movement and Spell Out. Ms., New York University.

4. Derivationalism and Modularity

Unit 7: Monostratal vs Modular Morphotactics

In this last unit we discuss Kiparsky’s reply to Arregi & Nevins (2012), and the more general nature of stratal and serial models of morphotactics, with considerations from psycholinguistic models of production.

Readings:

- Kiparsky, Paul. 2013. The Morphology of the Basque Auxiliary: Thoughts on Arregi & Nevins 2012. Ms., Stanford University.
- Pfau, Roland. 2009. *Grammar as Processor: A Distributed Morphology account of spontaneous speech errors*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Chapters 5 & 6.