Nutshell

- Suppletion is an interesting phenomenon, since it is subject to a general locality constraint on allomorphy and may thus display intervention effects (Harley & R. Noyer 1999; Bobaljik 2012).
- Empichik’s (2010) Adjacency Hypothesis (1) α - β - γ can condition β
  - Weak version of locality: Only heads with overt expression count.
  - Strong version of locality: All heads count.
- Chung (2009) has accounted for the interaction between negation and honorification in Korean, discribing defusing intervention.
- We provide a new dataset about the three-way allomorphy of give, suppletive allomorphy of /tal/ and may thus display intervention effects on allomorphy.

Research Questions: What are grammatical restrictions imposed on the conditioning suppletive allomorphy?

Background

- Distributed Morphology: division of labor between the components of grammar.
- Syntax only manipulates abstract morpho-syntactic features.
- Morphology may adjust the structure.
- At Vocabulary Insertion, a morpheme is replaced by the phonological exponent of a Vocabulary Item if this matches all or a subset of the features in the morpheme (Subject Principle).
- Allomorphs are phonological exponents in competition for the same grammatical features.

Data

- **/cwu/ ~ /tal/**
  - The elsewhereform for /cwu/ is /tal/; as in (3a-b).
  - If the indirect object is honorified as in (3c), allomorph /tal/ blocks the elsewhere form, /cwu/.

  (3) a. Chingwé ka na-ekey satbang-ul /cwu/-es-ta.
      friend-NOM I-DAT candy-ACC give-PST-DECL
      ‘The friend gave me a candy.’

  b. Sensayngnim-kkeyse na-ekey satbang-ul
teacher-HON.NOM I-DAT candy-ACC
    give-PST-DECL
    ‘The teacher gave me a candy.’

  c. Nay-ka sensayngnim-kkkey satbang-ul
    I-NOM teacher-DAT.HON candy-ACC
    give-PST-DECL
    ‘I gave the teacher a candy.’

- **/tal/ insertion is not problematic for the locality condition (cf. its lexical entry 7-a).**
- **/tal/ is confined to imperative contexts in which the dative argument is coreferential with the speaker as in (4a).**

  (4) a. (Ne) na-ekey satbang-ul /cwu/-tal-la.
      you.NOM I-DAT candy-ACC give/give-IMP
      ‘Give me a candy.’

- **/tal/ appears as a free variant in the same context (4b).**

  (4) b. (Ne) na-ekey satbang-ul cwu*/tal- ci-ma-la.
      you.NOM I-DAT candy-ACC give/give-CI-NEG-IMP
      ‘Do not give me a candy.’

- **/tal/ is confined to imperative contexts in which the dative argument is coreferential with the speaker as in (4a).**

 Assumption

- We assume a SAP projection on top of CP where Speaker and Addressee are located.
- The local context for vocabulary insertion is met through the following morphological operations:

  (5) **Pruning rule** (Empichik 2010)
      √ Root ~ [x, y] \[ [x, y] ~ Y \rightarrow \text{Root} ~ \text{Y} \]

- **It eliminates nodes with zero exponents cyclically.**
- We suggest this rule applies optionally.

  (6) **Node-sprouting rule** (Choi & Harley 2017):
      Hon’-sprouting rule: \[ v^0 \rightarrow [v^0 \text{Hon\'}] / [DP^0 + \text{Hon\'}] \mid [v^0 \ldots] \]

- A sprouted [+Hon\’] agreement morpheme (Hon’\) is adjoined to a v0 node - \[ \text{[NOM]} \rightarrow \text{[X, y]} / [\text{tal}] \mid [\text{mar}] \]

 Proposal

- **Stringent locality constraint should hold for suppletion.**
- The free variation can be explained with the optional application of the morphological operation.

Analysis

**[/tal/ insertion**

- The free variation between /tal/ and /cwu/ is explained by the (non-application) of the Pruning operation, which deletes the T node with [PRS] that has a zero exponent.

(8) Scenario 1: Pruning of T

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Cr]</th>
<th>[Tr]</th>
<th>[Cr]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[v^0 \rightarrow [v^0 \text{Speaker} \ldots] \mid v + V + \sqrt{\text{Given}}</td>
<td>T[\text{Prune}]</td>
<td>C[\text{mar}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[v^0 \rightarrow [v^0 \text{Speaker} \ldots] \mid v + V + \sqrt{\text{Given}}</td>
<td>C[\text{mar}]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[v^0 \rightarrow [v^0 \text{Speaker} \ldots] \mid v + V + /tal/</td>
<td>C[\text{mar}]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenario 2: No Pruning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Cr]</th>
<th>[Tr]</th>
<th>[Cr]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[v^0 \rightarrow [v^0 \text{Speaker} \ldots] \mid v + V + \sqrt{\text{Given}}</td>
<td>T[\text{Prune}]</td>
<td>C[\text{mar}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[v^0 \rightarrow [v^0 \text{Speaker} \ldots] \mid v + V + /cwu/</td>
<td>/ [\text{mar}]</td>
<td>/ [\text{mar}]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocking effects for /tal/ insertion

- When the Addressee bears an [+HON\’] feature, it triggers \[ v^0 \rightarrow \text{fission into } [v^0 \text{Hon\’}] \] by Node-sprouting.
- Hon’ is an intervenor between the verb root and the C head.
- Node-sprouting

(10) a. / [speaker] [v^0 \rightarrow [v^0 \text{Speaker} \ldots] \mid v + V + \sqrt{\text{Given}} | C[\text{mar}] |]
  b. / [v^0 \rightarrow [v^0 \text{Speaker} \ldots] \mid v + V + \sqrt{\text{Given}} | C[\text{mar}] |]
  c. / [v^0 \rightarrow [v^0 \text{Speaker} \ldots] \mid v + /cwu/ | / [\text{mar}] |]

- In this context, the (non)-application of Pruning does not affect the outcome.
- As expected, /tal/ is blocked with intervening honorification as in (4c), and the same mechanism applies to the case of negation as in (4b).

Conclusion

- We have provided further evidence that a stringent locality constraint must hold for conditioning suppletive allomorphy.
- Our analysis has accounted for the cases of (i) the transparent intervention effects and (ii) the opaque patterns (counterbleeding & counterfeeding) under a strong locality condition.

- We observe the clear patterns interwoven of the benefactive argument.

(11) a. [Aki’s-1ul] baby-ACC for I-DAT that knows-ACC give-IMP
    ‘Give me that knife for the sake of the baby.’

- The difference of the actual recipient of the object determines the choice of allomorph between /tal/ and /cwu/.

(12) a. / [speaker] [v^0 \rightarrow [v^0 \text{Speaker} \ldots] \mid v + V + \sqrt{\text{Given}} | C[\text{mar}] |]
  b. / [v^0 \rightarrow [v^0 \text{Speaker} \ldots] \mid v + V + \sqrt{\text{Given}} | C[\text{mar}] |]

- How can preference of alternations regarding on relative saliency of recipients be explained?