

# snippets

Issue 34 - December 2018  
Special Issue on Non-local Contextual Allomorphy

## Contents

1. Itamar Kastner and Beata Moskal. *Non-local contextual allomorphy: Introduction to the special issue.*
2. Marijke De Belder. *Root allomorphy depends on head movement: Support from Breton pluralization.*
3. Benjamin Bruening. *Non-local allomorphy in Passamaquoddy-Maliseet.*
4. Amy Rose Deal. *Locality in allomorphy and presyntactic bundling: A case of tense and aspect.*
5. Dmitry Ganenkov. *The ABA pattern in Nakh-Daghestanian pronominal inflection.*
6. Hyunjung Lee and Irene Amato. *A hybrid locality constraint on allomorphy: Evidence from Korean.*
7. Yi-Chi Yvette Wu. *Non-local allomorphy in Kannada.*

# Non-local allomorphy in Kannada

Yi-Chi Yvette Wu · University of California, Berkeley

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snip-2018-034-wuyv>

Within the framework of Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993), the exact mechanisms of contextual allomorphy depend on what locality restrictions are imposed during Vocabulary Insertion (Bobaljik 2012, Embick 2003). The marking of tense in Kannada indicative verb forms suggests that allomorphy can be linearly and structurally non-local.

Kannada indicatives are inflected for tense, person, gender, and number. In affirmative forms (1), a tense suffix attaches to the root, followed by agreement. In negative forms (2), agreement surfaces directly after the root, without a tense suffix or overt negative marker. The table (3) is a partial agreement paradigm for Kannada (Hodson 1859, Melinamath 2014).

(1) nōḍ-utt-ēne  
see-PRES-1.SG  
'I see.'

(2) nōḍ-∅-enu  
see-NEG-1.SG  
'I do/did/will not see.'

(3) Partial indicative verb agreement paradigm

		PRES (-utt-)	PAST (-id-)	FUT (-uv-)	NEG
1	SG	-ēne	-enu	-enu	-enu
	PL	-ēve	-evu	-evu	-evu
M	SG	-āne	-anu	-anu	-anu
	PL	-āre	-aru	-aru	-aru
3	SG	-āḷe	-aḷu	-aḷu	-aḷu
	PL	-āre	-aru	-aru	-aru
N	SG	-ade	-adu	-adu	-adu
	PL	-ave	-avu	-avu	-avu

I propose the parse in (4). In negative forms, Neg is projected and an impoverishment rule (5) deletes all tense features on T; then, by the Subset Principle (Halle and Marantz 1993), none of the vocabulary items for tense (6) can apply to T. Impoverishment here allows us to capture the systematic lack of tense marking in negative forms.

(4)  $\sqrt{\text{ROOT-}v\text{-(Neg)-T-Agr}_1\text{-Agr}_2\text{-FV}}$

(5)  $T \rightarrow \emptyset / \text{Neg } \_$

(6) [PRES]  $\leftrightarrow$  -utt-  
[PAST]  $\leftrightarrow$  -id-  
[FUT]  $\leftrightarrow$  -uv-

The issue of locality becomes apparent in agreement marking. Traditionally, the forms in (3) have been treated as a whole as agreement. I argue that “agreement” in Kannada actually reflects three morphemes: Agr<sub>1</sub>, a vowel that marks person (7); Agr<sub>2</sub>, a consonant that marks gender and number (8); and a final vowel (FV) that is conditioned by tense. As the person and gender/number markers function rather independently, they should not be considered a single Agr morpheme. Furthermore, FV patterns with tense features and should not be considered part of the Agr morphemes.

(7) [1] ↔ -e-  
elsewhere ↔ -a-

(8) [-PL] ↔ -n-  
[+F -PL] ↔ -ɻ-  
[+N -PL] ↔ -d-  
[+PL] ↔ -v-  
[-N +PL] ↔ -r-

What challenges the theory of adjacency is that FV is conditioned by information on T. As shown in (9), the more specified vocabulary item *-e* is inserted in context of T<sub>[PRES]</sub>, while the elsewhere case *-u* is inserted for past, future, and negative forms. This corroborates the impoverishment rule in (5), as all negative forms have the elsewhere case *-u*.

(9) [FV] ↔ -e / [PRES] ... \_\_  
[FV] ↔ -u

However, FV is linearly and structurally separated from T by the Agr morphemes. Positioning tense features on FV could resolve the adjacency issue, but this would wrongly predict *-e* and not *-u* in present negative forms. There would need to be two impoverishment rules, one for T and one for FV, but this misses the generalization that negative forms are tenseless. Thus it appears that FV is sensitive to features on T, exhibiting both linearly and structurally non-local contextual allomorphy.

## References

- Bobaljik, Jonathan D. 2012. *Universals in Comparative Morphology: Suppletion, Superlatives, and the Structure of Words*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Embick, David. 2003. Locality, listedness, and morphological identity. *Studia Linguistica* 57:143-169.
- Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In Hale, Kenneth, and Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 111-176. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hodson, Thomas. 1859. *An Elementary Grammar of the Kannada, or Canarese Language*. Bangalore: Wesleyan Mission Press.
- Melinamath, Bhuvaneshwari C. 2014. Morphological generator for Kannada nouns and verbs. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer Science and Software Engineering* 4:1300-1306.

Yi-Chi Yvette Wu  
yvette.yichi.wu@berkeley.edu

Department of Linguistics  
University of California, Berkeley  
1203 Dwinelle Hall #2650  
Berkeley, CA 94720  
USA