

Postsyntactic Reordering in the Mari Nominal Domain

Evidence from Suspended Affixation

Philipp Weisser - University of Connecticut
philipp.weisser@uconn.edu

Goals of this talk:

- ① The order of morphemes in the nominal domain in the eastern Uralic languages is unusual in several respects. It is argued that the actual surface order should nevertheless be derived on the basis of a syntactic structure that is consistent with the standard assumptions about DP syntax and Baker's (1985) Mirror Principle.
- ② It is argued that several operations change the orders of morphemes postsyntactically. The ordering of these operations will be crucial as these operations interact in various ways giving rise to opacity.
- ③ The analysis thus provides a strong argument for a derivational nature of the postsyntactic module as laid out in Arregi & Nevins (2012)

Evidence for these goals comes from *Suspended Affixation* in Meadow Mari, a process that is known to delete the right edge of nominal phrases in coordination. It can be shown that *Suspended Affixation* in Mari applies to an underlying representation rather than to the surface order of morphemes which allows us to pinpoint the order of morphemes at an intermediate point of the derivation.

1 The nominal template of Meadow Mari

Nouns in Meadow Mari are inflected for number, case and the features of their possessors. The order of these morphemes in Meadow Mari differs significantly from those found in other language families. Most notably, it can be observed that there are two classes of case markers occurring in different slots.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(1) pasu-vlak-ešte-na
garden-PL-INESS-1PL.POSS
'in our gardens' (INESSIVE)</p> | <p>(2) pasu-vlak-na-m
garden-PL-1PL.POSS-ACC
'our gardens' (ACCUSATIVE)</p> |
| Meadow Mari ¹ | |

However, this is not the only unusual thing we find in the nominal template of Meadow Mari. The plural marker /-vlak/ which usually occurs right next to the stem, can optionally follow the possessive affix:

- (3) pasu-vlak-na
garden-PL-1PL.POSS
'our gardens'
- (4) pasu-na-vlak
garden-1PL.POSS-PL
'our gardens' Meadow Mari

Combining these different alternations, we end up with quite a number of possible nominal templates in Meadow Mari. The following table summarizes the possible orders of morphemes (see Alhoniemi (1993) and Luutonen (1997) for discussion).

- (5) Possible orders of morphemes in the Meadow Mari nominal template:

Affixes	Categories	Example
(a) PL > POSS	# > D	'pasu-vlak-na'
(b) POSS > PL	D > #	'pasu-na-vlak'
(c) PL > LOCAL.CASE	# > K_{loc}	'pasu-vlak-ešte'
(d) PL > STRUCTURAL.CASE	# > K_{struc}	'pasu-vlak-em'
(e) LOCAL.CASE > POSS	K_{loc} > D	'pasu-šte-na'
(f) POSS > STRUCTURAL.CASE	D > K_{struc}	'pasu-na-m'
(g) PL > LOCAL.CASE > POSS	# > K_{loc} > D	'pasu-vlak-ešte-na'
(h) POSS > PL > LOCAL.CASE	D > # > K_{loc}	? 'pasu-na-vlak-ešte'
(i) PL > POSS > STRUCTURAL.CASE	# > D > K_{struc}	'pasu-vlak-na-m'
(j) POSS > PL > STRUCTURAL.CASE	D > # > K_{struc}	'pasu-na-vlak-em'

Despite the many possible affix orders in Meadow Mari, I argue that they are all derived from a uniform syntactic structure that is consistent with the standard assumptions about DP syntax and the Mirror Principle. Evidence for this assumption comes from a process called Suspended Affixation (SA).

2 Suspended Affixation

SA deletes affixes at the right edges of non-final conjuncts in coordination if they identical with the affixes of the final conjuncts.

- (6) köy, kasaba ve kent-ler-imiz-den
village town and city-PL-1PL.POSS-ABL
'from our villages, towns, cities.' Turkish: Göksel & Kerslake 2005, p.458

SA is found many OV-languages in Asia in languages like Turkish (see e.g. Kornfilt 1996; Good & Yu 2005; Kabak 2007; Broadwell 2008, Japanese and Korean (see Yoon & Lee 2005), Armenian, Ossetic (Ershler 2012), Nivkh, Nepali etc.

¹All Meadow Mari data (unless otherwise stated) were collected with the help of Elina Guseva, a native speaker of Mari from Yoshkar-Ola (Mari El Republic - Russia).

(7) **The Right-Edge Condition on Suspended Affixation:**

Inflectional affixes can only be deleted by Suspended Affixation if they form a coherent string at the right edge of a non-final conjunct.

The patterns of SA in Turkish below illustrate the Right-Edge condition nicely:

(8) Acceptable Patterns of SA in Turkish:

- a) Stem -PL -POSS ~~-CASE~~
- b) Stem -PL ~~-POSS~~ ~~-CASE~~
- c) Stem ~~-PL~~ ~~-POSS~~ ~~-CASE~~

(9) a. kedi-ler-im ve köpek-ler-im-i
cat-PL-1SG and dog-PL-1SG-ACC

'my cats and dogs (ACC)'

- b. kasaba-lar ve köy-ler-imiz-de
town-PL and village-PL-1PL-LOC

'In our towns and villages (LOC)'

Turkish: Kabak 2007, p.337

2.1 SA in Meadow Mari

Meadow Mari has two conjunctions /da/ and /den/. SA is found only with the conjunction /den/. The following minimal pair illustrates the pattern nicely:

- (10) a. Pörjeng tej-em da tud-em už-eš.
Man.NOM 2.SG-ACC and 3.SG-ACC see-3.SG.PRES
'The man sees you and him'
- b. Pörjeng tej den tud-em už-eš.
Man.NOM 2.SG-NOM and 3.SG-ACC see-3.SG.PRES
'The man sees you and him'

Meadow Mari

In (10-a), with the conjunction /da/, no SA applies. We see that both conjuncts bear the accusative marker /em/. However, in (10-b), with the conjunction /den/, only the second conjunct bears the accusative. The first conjunct is unmarked, which is, in this case, identical to the nominative. The process is not specific to case. Number marking can be deleted as well:

- (11) Me peres, pij den kajek-vlak-em už-am.
1SG cat.NOM dog.NOM and birds-PL-ACC see-1SG.PRES
'I see cats, dogs and birds.'
'I see a cat, a dog and birds.'

(11) also illustrates that, with more than two conjuncts, all non-final conjuncts undergo deletion.

Deletion of case markers in coordination with the conjunction /den/ is more or less obligatory (12), number marking can be retained (see (13)) if the ambiguity that arises is problematic. Usually, number is deleted as well.

- (12) ??Me peres-vlak-em den pij-vlak-em už-am.
1SG cat-PL-ACC and dog-PL-ACC see-1SG.PRES
'I see cats and birds.'

- (13) ?Me peres-vlak den pij-vlak-em už-am.
 1SG cat-PL and dog.PL-ACC see-1SG.PRES
 ‘I see cats and birds.’

Importantly, there is a condition that only right edges can be deleted. It is completely impossible to retain case marking but to delete number marking.

- (14) *Me peres-em den pij-vlak-em už-am.
 1SG cat-ACC and dog.PL-ACC see-1SG.PRES
 ‘I see cats and birds.’

As pointed out by Ershler (2012) for Ossetic and Armenian, the non-final conjuncts do not typically bear the nominative. Rather, they bear the oblique stem on the basis of which the deleted case marker is formed. In Mari, we can observe that non-final conjuncts need not bear any case.

- (15) a. Pörjeng memnam da nunem užeš
 Man.NOM us.ACC and them.ACC sees.3.SG
 b. Pörjeng memna den nunem užeš
 Man.NOM us.??? and them.ACC sees.3.SG
 ‘The man sees us and them.’ PRON.NOM.1PL = me

The form /memna/ in (15-b) is not attested in the pronominal paradigm of Mari at all. It is simply the remnant of the actual accusative case form /memnam/ minus the accusative marker /m/. This strongly suggests that Suspended Affixation is an ellipsis process, rather than an actual difference of feature specification on both conjuncts (see Ershler 2012).

So far, examples of SA only contained case and number affixes. If examples contain a possessive affix in addition, things become more complicated.

- (16) Nuno memnan pört den sad-vlak-eške-na tolenet.
 3PL 1PL.GEN house and garden-PL-ILL-1PL came.
 ‘They came to our houses and our gardens.’

When deleting only a subset of the affixes, the right edge condition can be violated:

- (17) Üder mej-en uše-m den tej-en süm-ešte-t.
 girl 1SG-GEN mind-1SG and 2SG-GEN heart-INESS-2SG
 ‘The girl is in my mind and in your heart.’
 (18) uš- ešte -m
 mind- INESS -1SG

Local case markers can be deleted even though the possessive agreement morpheme is located on the right edge of the phrase.

- (19) A-vlak tud-en sad-še den memn-an pasu-vlak-ešte-na mod-et.
 child-PL 3SG-GEN garden-3SG and 1PL-GEN field-PL-INESS-1PL play-3PL.PRES
 ‘The children are playing in his gardens and in our fields’
 (20) sad- ~~v~~lak- ešte- še
 garden- PL- INESS- 1PL.POSS

The following table lists all possible combinations and the respective deletion patterns:

(21) Patterns of deletion with local case:

	1st conjunct	Judgment
(a)	stem - PL - LOC.CASE - POSS	✗
(b)	stem - PL - LOC.CASE - POSS	✗
(c)	stem - PL - LOC.CASE - POSS	✓
(d)	stem - PL - LOC.CASE - POSS	✓
(e)	stem - PL - LOC.CASE - POSS	✗
(f)	stem - PL - LOC.CASE - POSS	✗
(g)	stem - PL - LOC.CASE - POSS	✓
(h)	stem - PL - LOC.CASE - POSS	✓

(22) Patterns of deletion with structural cases:

	1st conjunct	Judgment
(a)	stem - PL - POSS - STRUC.CASE	✗
(b)	stem - PL - POSS - STRUC.CASE	✗
(c)	stem - PL - POSS - STRUC.CASE	✓
(d)	stem - PL - POSS - STRUC.CASE	✓
(e)	stem - PL - POSS - STRUC.CASE	✗
(f)	stem - PL - POSS - STRUC.CASE	✗
(g)	stem - PL - POSS - STRUC.CASE	✓
(h)	stem - PL - POSS - STRUC.CASE	✓

⇒ Local and structural cases behave totally identical with respect to their deletion properties even though they occupy different positions in the template.

⇒ In Meadow Mari, unlike in Turkish, non-final elements can be deleted even though final ones are retained. The plural marker /-vlak/ and also local case markers can be deleted even though they are followed by the possessive affix.

↪ This raises the question whether SA can receive a unified analysis in Mari and other languages.

3 The Analysis

Two questions have been raised in the previous sections:

- ① Should the order of morphemes be derived on the basis of a uniform syntactic structure?
- ② Can Suspended Affixation in Meadow Mari and in Turkish receive a unified explanation even though the conditions on which morphemes can be deleted are strikingly different?

In the following, I will propose an analysis that allows for a unified analysis of Suspended Affixation in Mari and Turkish *and* allows to maintain the standard assumptions about DP syntax and the Mirror Principle.

The analysis in a nutshell:

- The syntax inside the DP (or KP as we will see) in Meadow Mari conforms to standard assumptions about nominal syntax.
 - ↳ There are, however, certain postsyntactic operations in Meadow Mari that obscure the underlying order of morphemes.
- Suspended Affixation does not apply on the basis of surface orders. Rather it applies on the basis of an intermediate representation.
 - ↳ In Turkish, (and Ossetian, Armenian, etc.), no reordering operations follow SA. Thus, SA seemingly applies on what is the surface order.
 - ↳ In Mari, however, at least one metathesis operation subsequently changes the order of morphemes creating the impression that non-final morphemes are deleted.

In the following, I will propose an analysis that allows for a unified analysis of Suspended Affixation in Mari and Turkish *and* allows to maintain the standard assumptions about DP syntax and the Mirror Principle. The concrete assumptions I make are the following:

- The highest syntactic category heading noun phrases is KP (see Travis & Lamontagne (1992); Bittner & Hale (1996); Bayer et al. (2001)). The underlying structure for KPs is thus the following (see e.g. Alexiadou & Wilder (1998), Harley & Ritter (2002), McFadden (2004))

(23) $[_{KP} [_{DP} [_{\#P} NP \#] D] K]$

Num hosts the plural affix /-vlak/, D hosts the possessive affixes, and K hosts the various case markers.

- There are various idiosyncratic postsyntactic processes at work in Meadow Mari. These include:


① Lowering of D (D-L) (see McFadden 2004):

A postsyntactic process that lowers D to left-adjoin to # (as in (27)). Applies on the basis of hierarchical structure (i.e. prior to linearization) (cf. Embick & Noyer (2001), McFadden (2004)).

The process is optional and thus derives the alternation between (24) and (25).


(24) pasu-vlak-na
garden-PL-1PL.POSS
'our gardens'

(25) pasu-na-vlak
garden-1PL.POSS-PL
'our gardens'



② Suspended Affixation (SA):

Deletes the features of a head at the right edge of a KP if the features are recoverable in the final conjunct (as in (26)). Applies to linearized structures.



③ D-Metathesis (D-M):

Changes the order of D and a K-head bearing a local case feature (and possibly an intervening #). D-M is obligatory and applies to linearized structures.

(27) D-Metathesis (formulated in Harris and Halle's (2005) Generalized Reduplication formalism):

1. Structural description:
$$\begin{array}{c} [_{KP} NP D X K \\ | \\ \{case:LOC\} \end{array}$$

2. Structural change:

- i. Insert [to the immediate left of D and] to the immediate right of K.
- ii. Insert > to the immediate right of D.

The effects of (27) are the following:

(28)
$$\begin{array}{l} NP D K_{loc} \Rightarrow \\ NP [D] > [K_{loc}] \Rightarrow \\ NP - \boxed{D} K_{loc} - D \boxed{K_{loc}} \Rightarrow \\ NP K_{loc} D \end{array}$$

(29)
$$\begin{array}{l} NP D \# K_{loc} \Rightarrow \\ NP [D] > \# [K_{loc}] \Rightarrow \\ NP - \boxed{D} \# K_{loc} - D \boxed{\# K_{loc}} \Rightarrow \\ NP \# K_{loc} D \end{array}$$

By reordering the local cases and the possessive affix, D-M derives the alternation between (30) and (31):

(30)
$$\begin{array}{l} pasu-vlak-ešte-na \\ garden-PL-INESS-1PL.POSS \\ \text{'in our gardens' (INESSIVE)} \end{array}$$

(31)
$$\begin{array}{l} pasu-vlak-na-m \\ garden-PL-1PL.POSS-ACC \\ \text{'our garden (ACCUSATIVE)'} \end{array}$$

These language-specific processes are now ordered in the following way (including the two operations Linearization (LIN) and Vocabulary Insertion (VI):

(32) Order of Operations:

$$\boxed{D-L} > \boxed{LIN} > \boxed{SA} > \boxed{D-M} > \boxed{VI}$$

Given this order of operations, it is possible to derive (a) the possible and impossible morpheme orders of Meadow Mari and (b) the (in)ability to delete under SA.

4 The Derivations

4.1 Deriving the order of morphemes

To derive the whole pattern of possible orders of morphemes in the nominal template of Meadow Mari, we must consider the effects of two postsyntactic processes: D-L and D-M.

The syntactic structure that serves as the basis for all the possible postsyntactic operations that we have to consider is the following:

- (33) Syntactic Output Structure:
 $[_{KP} [_{DP} [_{\#P} NP \#] D] K]$

Based on this structure, we can derive the orders in question by applying D-L and D-M. We start with simple examples with only two morphemes:

- (34) Number and Possessive:

	Input	D-L	Intermediate	D-M	Output
a)	NP - # - D	✗	NP - # - D	✗	NP - # - D
b)	NP - # - D	✓	NP - D - #	✗	NP - D - #

Since D-L is optional, it generates both orders (NP D # and NP # D). D-M does not apply since its description is not met (there is no local case feature).

- (35) Possessive and Case:

	Input	D-L	Intermediate	D-M	Output
a)	NP - D - K_{loc}	✗	NP - D - K_{loc}	✓	NP - K_{loc} - D
b)	NP - D - K_{struc}	✗	NP - D - K_{struc}	✗	NP - D - K_{struc}

Since there is no overt #, D-L has no effects. In (35-a), D-M applies changing the order of D and K_{loc} . In (35-b), D-M does not apply since its description is not met (there is no K_{loc}).

- (36) Number and Case:

	Input	D-L	Intermediate	D-M	Output
a)	NP - # - K	✗	NP - # - K	✗	NP - # - K

Neither D-L nor D-M change the order of morphemes since there is no overt D. Hence, the only possible order is # - K

Now we turn to cases with three morphemes involved in the order changes. In (37), an intermediate representation is given that shows the order of morphemes at the point of the derivation after D-L and before D-M.

- (37) Number, Possessive and Local Case:

	Input	D-L	Intermediate	D-M	Output
a)	NP - # - D - K_{loc}	✗	NP - # - D - K_{loc}	✓	NP - # - K_{loc} - D
b)	NP - # - D - K_{loc}	✓	NP - D - # - K_{loc}	✓	NP - # - K_{loc} - D

In (37-a) and (37-b), the input involves a K_{loc} case marker. Here, we see that regardless of whether the optional D-L applies, D-M will overwrite all of its effects and the order with K_{loc} -

Case and Possessive:

One intermediate representation:

N - D - K

- (42) a. Üder mej-en uše-m den tej-en süm-ešte-t.
 girl 1SG-GEN mind-1SG and 2SG-GEN heart-INESS-2SG
 ‘The girl is in my mind and in your heart.’

Deletion of K_{local} but not of D

- b. Me iza-m den aka-m-en pörtešt-em už-am.
 1SG brother-1SG and sister-1SG-GEN house-ACC see-1SG.PRES
 ‘I see my brother’s and my sister’s house.’

Deletion of $K_{structural}$ but not of D**Number and Case:**

One intermediate representations:

N - # - K

- (43) Me peres-vlak den pij-vlak-em už-am.
 1SG cat-PL and dog.PL-ACC see-1SG.PRES
 ‘I see cats and dogs.’

Deletion of K but not of #

Number, Possessive and Local Case:

Two possible intermediate representations:

NP - # - D - K

NP - D - # - K

- (44) A-vlak tud-en sad-še den memn-an pasu-vlak-ešte-na mod-et.
 child-PL 3SG-GEN garden-3SG and 1PL-GEN field-PL-INESS-1PL play-3PL.PRES
 ‘The children are playing in his gardens and in our fields’

Deletion of K and # but not of D

- (45) Nuno memna-n pört-vlak den sad-vlak-eške-na tol-en-et.
 3PL 1PL-GEN house-PL and garden-PL-ILL-1PL come-PAST-3PL
 ‘They came to our houses and our gardens.’

Deletion of K and D but not of #

Number, Possessive and Structural Case:

Two possible intermediate representations:

NP - # - D - K

NP - D - # - K

- (46) Tudo oksa-m šole-ž den šüžar-že-vlak-lan pu-en.
 3SG money-ACC brothers-3SG and sister-3SG-PL-DAT give-3SG.PAST
 ‘He gave money to his brothers and his sisters.’

Deletion of K and # but not of D

- (47) Me memna-n peres-vlak den pij-vlak-na-m už-am.
 1SG 1PL-GEN cat-PL and dog-PL-1SG-ACC see-1SG.PRES
 ‘I see our cats and dogs.’

Deletion of K and D but not of #

Interim Summary:

By assuming two distinct postsyntactic operations (i.e. LOWERING OF D and D-METATHESIS), we were able to derive the unusual morpheme orders in the Meadow Mari nominal domain.

↔ We can therefore maintain the assumption that the surface orders are derived on the basis of a uniform syntax.

The two very same operations allowed us to derive the seemingly irregular deletion patterns.

↔ We can therefore provide a unified analysis of Suspended Affixation in Mari and in Turkish.

5 Further Issues

5.1 Allomorphy and Suppletion

Further evidence for the order of operations in (32) comes from allomorphy and suppletion. One of the rare cases of allomorphy in Meadow Mari is found with the illative case marker.

(48) oms-aške / oms-aš
door-ILL
'to a door'

(49) oms-aške-m / *?oms-aš-em
door-ILL-1SG
'to my door'

If the illative marker is not followed by D, it can either be /eške/ or /eš/. If it is followed by a possessive affix, the latter is not an alternative.

In more technical terms, the vocabulary insertion into K is sensitive to whether D-M has applied or not. This is expected since D-M > VI. We can thus formulate the insertion rules for the illative marker as follows:

(50) ILLATIVE → -eške /₋ D[pers:α,#:β]]

(51) ILLATIVE → -eške *or* -eš

An interesting case of suppletion is found with the plural pronouns in Meadow Mari which undergo stem suppletion in the genitive, the accusative and (for most speakers) the dative.

(52) Pronominal Paradigm of 1PL and 2PL in Meadow Mari

	1PL	2PL
NOMINATIVE	me	te
GENITIVE	memna-n	tenda-n
ACCUSATIVE	memna-m	tenda-m
DATIVE	memna-lan me-lan-na	tenda-lan te-lan-da
COMITATIVE	me-ye	te-ye

Alhoniemi (1993:79)

In (53) we see that if a 1st person pronoun is the first conjunct of a conjoined direct object (bearing the accusative), SA leaves just the suppletive stem as a remnant.

- (53) a. Pörjeng memna den nunem užeš
 Man.NOM us.??? and them.ACC sees.3.SG
 ‘The man sees us and them.’

This shows that VI is sensitive to features that have been deleted under SA. This is unexpected under the current implementation since SA precedes VI.

In order to solve this dilemma, we can refine the definition of SA saying that it rather marks certain heads for zero-insertion rather than actually deleting the features on these heads.

(54) Suspended Affixation SA: (*final*)

Marks heads at the right edge of a KP for zero-exponence if their features are recoverable in the final conjunct (as in (55)). Applies to linearized structures.

- (55)
$$\begin{array}{c} [\alpha \quad \beta \quad \gamma] \ \& \ [\alpha \quad \beta \quad \gamma] \\ \begin{array}{ccc} | & | & | \\ \{F1\} & \{F2\} & \{F3\} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{ccc} | & | & | \\ \{F1\} & \{F4\} & \{F3\} \end{array} \end{array}$$
- $$\vec{SA} \quad \begin{array}{c} [\alpha \quad \beta \quad \gamma_\emptyset] \ \& \ [\alpha \quad \beta \quad \gamma] \\ \begin{array}{ccc} | & | & | \\ \{F1\} & \{F2\} & \{F3\} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{ccc} | & | & | \\ \{F1\} & \{F4\} & \{F3\} \end{array} \end{array}$$

This solves the problem inasmuch as it does not actually delete the features on the non-final conjuncts. Rather, it marks the heads in question for non-insertion (see Murphy (2015) for a similar implementation of deletion under Gapping).

5.2 The Importance of the Sequential Derivation

The present analysis makes use of an extremely derivational concept of the postsyntactic module as laid out in Arregi & Nevins (2008, 2012). The operations that apply in the Meadow Mari nominal domain must necessarily apply in the order in (56) to obtain the correct results.

- (56) Order of Operations:

$$\boxed{D-L} > \boxed{LIN} > \boxed{SA} > \boxed{D-M} > \boxed{VI}$$

This order of operations is crucial to derive the morpheme orders and, more importantly, the deletion patterns.

A representational account such as Ryan (2010), who uses bigram constraints that punish certain morpheme orderings as in (57), can easily derive the Meadow Mari ordering patterns.

(57) Evaluation of Mari morpheme order by bigram constraints à la Ryan (2010)

		*K-#	*K ₂ -D	*D-K ₁	*#-D	*D-#	*K ₁ -D	*D-K ₂	*#-K
	√-#-D-K ₁			*!	*				*
☞	√-#-K ₁ -D				*		*		*
	√-D-#-K ₁			*!		*			*
	√-D-K ₁ -#	*!		*		*			
	√-#-K ₂ -D		*!						*
☞	√-#-D-K ₂				*			*	*
☞	√-D-#-K ₂					*		*	*
	√-D-K ₂ -#	*!						*	

Crucially, the account cannot derive the deletion facts in any similarly straightforward way as there is no intermediate representation that SA could refer to. All reordering processes are dealt with simultaneously in a representational fashion.

The present analysis relies on the assumption of a stepwise application of postsyntactic operations and thus strongly supports derivational nature of the postsyntactic module as laid out in Arregi & Nevins (2008, 2012)

5.3 SA in Turkish and the relation to other deletion processes

Unlike in the analysis above, SA in Turkish has generally not been analyzed as a deletion process. The main argument against a deletion approach in Turkish comes from the fact that there are a number of well-formedness conditions on the first conjunct. Kabak (2007) argues that the first conjunct must end in what he calls a terminal suffix. Aspect, modality or ϕ -agreement suffixes are terminal suffixes whereas tense is not.

- (58) a. *Calis-ti ve basar-di-k.
work-PAST and succeed-PAST-1SG
'We worked and succeeded.'
b. Calis-ir ve basar-ir-iz.
work-AOR and succeed-AOR-1SG
'We work and succeed.'

Turkish: Kabak (2007)


Similarly, Turkish, unlike Mari, does not allow for SA when pronouns are involved.

- (59) *Ilk once sen/san ve ban-a bak-ti
first 2SG and 1SG-DAT look
Intended meaning: 'S/he first looked at you and me.'

Turkish: Kabak (2007)

Broadwell (2008) sketches an LFG-approach using lexical sharing, an operation that seems to share a number of properties with multidominance approaches couched in the Minimalist frameworks.

(60) A Multidominance Representation of SA in Turkish:



Given the suppletion data in (15) and the general reordering spirit of the present analysis, the same analysis does not transfer to Mari.

- ↪ If Broadwell's MD analysis is on the right track, then we have arrived at a parallel solution as we find with Right Node Raising.
- ↪ Completely independently from the present discussion, recent analyses of Right Node Raising (RNR) have arrived at a point where it has been argued convincingly that neither an ellipsis account, nor a multidominance structure can fully derive all the observed facts (see Barros & Vicente (2011) and Larson (2012)).
- ⇒ This provides a strong argument for the assumption that
 - (i) SA is, in a sense, the word-internal counterpart of RNR and
 - (ii) the dual analysis of SA (and RNR) is in fact justified.

6 Conclusion

In this talk, I sketched an analysis that derives the morphological template of the noun phrase of Meadow Mari. The main assumptions of the analysis were:

- The underlying syntactic structure corresponds to the standard assumptions about DP syntax and the application of Baker's Mirror Principle.
- The specific morpheme orders of the Mari template were derived by two postsyntactic rules applying in a specific order.
- The Suspended Affixation operation applies at a certain point in the derivation at which it is fed by some of the operations but counterfed by others giving rise to opacity.

Under these assumptions, the analysis was able to capture...

- ... the variation of the morphological template in Meadow Mari which allowed for several of the possible affix orders while systematically excluding others.
- ... the complex but still systematic nature of the Suspended Affixation operation which, unlike in Turkish, does not always affect morphemes located at the right edge of surface orders.

In doing so, this analysis provides strong arguments for...

- ... the importance of Baker's (1985) Mirror Principle as a core principle of the syntax-morphology interface.
- ... the need for intermediate representations and thus a derivational account to postsyntax as laid out by Arregi & Nevins (2012).

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis & Chris Wilder (1998): *Possessors, predicates and movement in the determiner phrase*. Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Alhoniemi, Alho (1993): *Grammatik des Tscheremissischen (Mari): mit Texten und Glossar*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Arregi, Karlos & Andre Nevins (2008): A Principled Order to Postsyntactic Operations. available at lingbuzz/000646.
- Arregi, Karlos & Andrew Nevins (2012): *Morphotactics: Basque Auxiliaries and the Structure of Spellout*. Springer Dordrecht.
- Baker, Mark (1985): The Mirror Principle and morphosyntactic explanation, *Linguistic Inquiry* 16(3), 373–415.
- Barros, Matthew & Luis Vicente (2011): The eclectic nature of Right Node Raising. submitted.
- Bayer, Josef, Markus Bader & Michael Meng (2001): Morphological underspecification meets oblique case: Syntactic and processing effects in German, *Lingua* 111, 465–514.
- Bittner, Maria & Ken Hale (1996): The structural determination of case and agreement, *Linguistic Inquiry* 27(1), 1–68.
- Broadwell, George Aaron (2008): Turkish Suspended Affixation is Lexical Sharing. In: M. Butt & T. H. King, eds., *Proceedings of the LFG08 Conference*. .
- Embick, David & Rolf Noyer (2001): Movement operations after syntax, *Linguistic Inquiry* 32, 555–595.
- Ershler, David (2012): Suspended Affixation and the Structure of Syntax-Morphology Interface, *Studia Linguistica Hungarica* 59, 153–175.

- Göksel, Aslı & Cecilia Kerslake (2005): *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. Routledge Comprehensive Grammars, Routledge.
- Good, Jeff & Alan Yu (2005): Morphosyntax of Two Turkish Subject Pronominal Paradigms. In: L. Heggie & F. Ordonez, eds., *Clitic and affix combinations: Theoretical perspectives*. Benjamins, pp. 315–341.
- Harley, Heidi & Elizabeth Ritter (2002): Person and number in pronouns: A feature-geometric analysis., *Language* 78, 482–526.
- Harris, James & Morris Halle (2005): Unexpected plural inflections in Spanish: Reduplication and metathesis, *Linguistic Inquiry* 36, 196–222.
- Kabak, Barış (2007): Turkish Suspended Affixation, *Linguistics* 45(2), 311–347.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin (1996): On some copular clitics in Turkish, *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 6, 96–114.
- Larson, Bradley (2012): A Dilemma with Accounts of Right Node Raising, *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(1), 163–171.
- Luutonen, Jorna (1997): *The variation of morpheme order in Mari declension*. Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seuran Toimituksia [Memoires de la Societas Finno-Ougrienne] 226.
- McFadden, Thomas (2004): The position of morphological case in the derivation: A study on the syntax-morphology interface. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- Murphy, Andrew (2015): Subset relations in ellipsis licensing. submitted.
- Ryan, Kevin (2010): Variable affix order: Grammar and Learning, *Language* 86(4), 758–791.
- Travis, Lisa & Gregory Lamontagne (1992): The Case Filter and the licensing of empty K, *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 37, 157–174.
- Yoon, James Hye Suk & Wooseung Lee (2005): Conjunction Reduction and Its Consequences for Noun Phrase Morphosyntax in Korean. In: J. Alderete, C. hye Han & A. Kochetov, eds., *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. pp. 379–387.