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> acting upon (subject upon object)
1 first person
2 second person
2|3 second or third person
3 third person
A actor, or agent-like argument of a transitive verb
ABL ablative
ABS absolutive
ACC accusative
ACT active; actuality mood
ADJ adjunct
ADMON admonitive
AGAIN ‘again’ adverbial
ALL allative
AN action nominal
ANIM animate
AOR aorist
AS associated person
ASF adjective suffix
ASPL associative plural
ASS associative
ATTR attributive
AUG augmentative
AUX auxiliary
AVRS aversive
AW away
AWAY ‘away’ directional
B.IPFV basic imperfective
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BACK</td>
<td>‘back’ directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>benefactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>collative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>complementisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>contact localisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>A, S, or O non-focus argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTG</td>
<td>contingent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVB</td>
<td>converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEB</td>
<td>debitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC(L)</td>
<td>declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite (article)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIC</td>
<td>deictic (noun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>distal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTPST</td>
<td>distant past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON</td>
<td>donative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWN</td>
<td>‘downwards’ directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>determiner phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUB</td>
<td>dubitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUR</td>
<td>durative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPEN</td>
<td>epenthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVID</td>
<td>evidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_IMP</td>
<td>future imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_CL</td>
<td>F-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>finalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>general gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEST</td>
<td>hesternal (yesterday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HITHER</td>
<td>‘hither’ directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORT</td>
<td>hortative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPST</td>
<td>hodiernal past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>gender I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFUT</td>
<td>immediate future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>gender II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>gender III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMM</td>
<td>immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMMPST</td>
<td>immediate past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>‘in’ locational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCH</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEF</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFR</td>
<td>inferential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING</td>
<td>ingressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INP</td>
<td>involved mode of past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV</td>
<td>inverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InvO</td>
<td>object of inverse construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITER</td>
<td>iterative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>gender IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>ka-gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAT</td>
<td>lative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBASE</td>
<td>ellipted base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGOPH</td>
<td>logophoric pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>linking particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LROOT</td>
<td>ellipted root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_CL</td>
<td>m-classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>main clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>medial verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>minimal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MIX     mixed (gender)
MON     monitory
MU      multal
MWE     multiword expression
N       neuter
N1      neuter 1
N2      neuter 2
NAR     narrative
ND      non-dual
NEARFUT near future
NEARPST near past
NEG      negative
NFOC    narrow focus
NFRST   non-firsthand evidential
NM      non-masculine
NMLS    nominaliser
NOM     nominative
NP      noun phrase
NPREH   non-prehodiernal, any time from during the night last night on into the future
NPST    non-past
NSG     non-singular
NTRMC   non-transitive main clause
NTRS    non-transitive subject
NTRSC   non-transitive subordinate clause
NVC     nominalised verbal clause
O, OBJ  object
obl     oblique
P       patient-like argument of a transitive verb
PAR     participial
PART    partitive
PASS    passive
PDO     Principle of Derivational Opacity
PF      perfect
PFV     perfective
PIC     Principle of Islandhood for Compounds
PIT     Principle of Inflectional Transparency
PL      plural
PLA     greater plural
PN      proper name
POL     polite
POSS    possessive
POT     potential
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>pronominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>prepositional (case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRET</td>
<td>preterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREV</td>
<td>preverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROC</td>
<td>procrastinative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROL</td>
<td>prolative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>proximal, proximate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST.EVID</td>
<td>past evidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCP</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTM</td>
<td>phrase terminal maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>quotative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMPST, RPST</td>
<td>remote past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP</td>
<td>reputative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>reflexive/reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S, SBJ</td>
<td>subject, single argument of an intransitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>subordinate clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCM</td>
<td>subordinate clause complementisation marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ</td>
<td>sequential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>stem formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIM</td>
<td>simultaneous converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMUL</td>
<td>simultaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL</td>
<td>solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>somatic prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAT</td>
<td>spatial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>same subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>‘super’ (on) localisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>switch-reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>tense-aspect-mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>temporal-causal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THV</td>
<td>thematic vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNS</td>
<td>tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>toward command (deictic prefix indicating motion toward speaker, used on imperatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TODPST</td>
<td>today’s past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOW</td>
<td>towards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRMC</td>
<td>transitive main clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrO</td>
<td>transitive object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>radical-thematic vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>undergoer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>unmarked tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNP</td>
<td>uninvolved mode of non-past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>uninvolved mode of ‘before today’ past tense, ‘upwards’ directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENT</td>
<td>ventive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERIF</td>
<td>verificative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOL</td>
<td>volitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td>‘into water’ directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X &gt; Y</td>
<td>subject/agent X acting on object/patient Y, or possessor X of possessum Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XABL</td>
<td>ablative comparative morphomic category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XDAT</td>
<td>dative comparative morphomic category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XERGLOC</td>
<td>ergative–locative comparative morphomic category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XGEN</td>
<td>genitive comparative morphomic category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLOC</td>
<td>locative comparative morphomic category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XNOMZ</td>
<td>nominalisation comparative morphomic category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XOBL</td>
<td>oblique comparative morphomic category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPROP</td>
<td>proprietive/comparative morphomic category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPST</td>
<td>past comparative morphomic category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>polarity question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Taking the Morphological Perspective

*Matthew Baerman, Oliver Bond and Andrew Hippisley*

1.1 Introduction

In a field still dominated by syntactic perspectives, it is sometimes easy to overlook the words that are the building blocks of language. A *morphological* perspective on language takes words as the starting point for investigating linguistic structure: their form, their internal structure, their paradigmatic extensions, and their role in expressing and manipulating syntactic configurations. With a team of authors who run the typological gamut of languages, this book tackles questions in contemporary morphology from multiple perspectives, examining both the canonical and the non-canonical. By taking seriously the autonomy of morphology, and letting loose a full battery of analytical techniques, the chapters in this volume celebrate the pioneering work of Greville G. Corbett, whose illustrious career is marked by an endless search for answers, with stunning insights along the way.

Corbett is one of the world’s most influential typologists, responsible for leading the field into new and exciting territory. He has done this by tackling the most difficult and challenging of questions in morphology, a component of language so idiosyncratic and language specific that it might seem scarcely amenable to typological generalisations.

His work on morphosyntactic features has become defining in the field, and no discussion of gender or number would be complete without reference to his ground-breaking work, which has succeeded in making sense of these complex and cross-linguistically varied features. At the level of morphological expression, he has contributed significantly to a defaults-based approach to locate whatever generalisations there may be, and has elaborated a taxonomy of paradigmatic deviations that has provided a framework for understanding how morphological structure can break through the confines of other established linguistic structures. His forays into unexplored typological realms have led to the development of a careful and rigorous
framework, Canonical Typology, which has been instrumental in clarifying our understanding of a wide range of linguistic phenomena.

Here we highlight some of the major themes of Corbett’s work that have informed his morphological perspective on language, and influenced the ideas and outlook of each and every contributor to this volume: the autonomous principles of morphology revealed by mismatches in form and meaning (§1.2), the role of defaults in accounting for complex morphological phenomena (§1.3) and the insight that can be gained by decomposing linguistic patterns into fine-grained variables (§1.4).

1.2 A Paradigmatic Perspective

A running theme throughout Corbett’s work has been the autonomy of morphology, manifested most obviously through morphological mismatches, where elements of form behave in ways which appear to be independent of the meaning they (are supposed to) instantiate. If we take the evidence of these mismatches seriously, they describe the outlines of a purely morphological system of considerable scope and complexity, much more than the mere interface of syntax and phonology that it is sometimes understood to be.

1.2.1 Mismatches in Paradigms

The notion of paradigmatic mismatches can be defined in terms of canonical inflection (see in particular Corbett 2007a, 2015). The idea behind this is that an inflected word form expresses both lexical and grammatical meaning, and that in each case there is a one-to-one mapping between meaning and form. The consequences of this are mapped out in Table 1.1. In practical terms this means that the canonical inflected word will consist of a stem (the lexical material) and an affix or affixes (the grammatical material). Each lexeme will have a single invariant stem which is different from the stems of other lexemes. Affixes will be distinct from each other within the paradigm of a lexeme, but identical across the paradigms of different lexemes.

Word forms that deviate from the canonical situation either fail to make the distinctions in meaning that otherwise seem to underlie the system (the upper right or lower left cells in Table 1.1), or encode distinctions which are irrelevant or at cross-purposes to that system (the upper left or lower right cells). It is important to bear in mind that deviations from canonical inflection should not be regarded as aberrant or uncommon, merely that the conceptual and descriptive tools we avail ourselves of presuppose that things are set up in this way. In fact, most if not all inflectional systems show some kind of deviation from this schema.

The upper right-hand corner of Table 1.1 falls outside of a typology of inflectional mismatches, since homonymy exists entirely at the lexical level. The inflectional equivalent, however – syncretism – has been a key theoretical concern since at least the days of Hjelmslev (1935–7) and Jakobson ([1936] 1971). Syncretism refers to instances where inflected words fail to formally differentiate values which appear otherwise to be relevant in the grammar, either in inflection, or in other morpho-syntactic processes. This is often taken as indicative of underlying properties of the
Table 1.1 Deviations in form established by comparison across cells and lexemes (adapted from Corbett 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical situation</th>
<th>Types of deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lexical material (≈ shape of stem)</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inflectional material (≈ shape of affix)</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

taking the morphological perspective

feature system, both in terms of feature structure (e.g. where dual and plural number are expressed by a single ‘non-singular’ form in some contexts, but not others) and in terms of so-called markedness relationships (the tendency of values of one feature to be neutralised in the context of more marked values of another feature; see Haspelmath 2006 for a critical review of the notion), as in German or Russian, where gender values are not distinguished in the plural (see §1.3.2). As such, this view of syncretism is opposed to one in which the patterns of identity lie outside the feature system, i.e. as the result of regular sound change. Baerman et al. (2005) explore syncretism across a large and heterogeneous set of languages and find clear examples of both types, demonstrating the autonomy of morphology while at the same time acknowledging its dependence, however conditional, on a coherent system of features. And while most would probably reject the idea that a morphological formative that spans not just different values, but different word classes, warrants being seen as the same entity (e.g. the ending -s that marks third person singular present in she cooks but plural in three cooks), sometimes the temptation is too great, as pointed out by Aronoff (this volume).

The other type of deviation – encoding too many distinctions – represents a more diverse range of phenomena. (After all, there are more ways to be different than there are to be the same.) On the lexical side, it means that stems or roots take up at least part of the task of realising morphosyntactic distinctions, creating rich morphological subsystems of their own (see Palancar, this volume). In one sense this could be understood as just a detail of morphological realisation, amenable to a model in which inflectional material includes not just easily segmental affixes, but also floating features or otherwise abstract exponents that induce stem alternations; in some cases there is evidence of a class of hybrid entities, stem augments, which are part lexical and part affixal (Nichols, this volume). The existence of stem alternations has important ramifications on how we understand inflectional paradigms. Firstly, stem alternations often occur alongside purely affixal inflection, creating a situation of multiple exponence (Baerman and Corbett 2012) or distributed exponence (Carroll 2016; Evans, this volume), with all the attendant challenges to morphological description. Secondly, the morphological manipulation of lexical material may be so extreme as to cross over the line into suppletion, where by all appearances two or more lexemes
have been joined into a single paradigm. Corbett (2007a) shows both the internal diversity of the phenomenon, and that many deeply held assumptions about its nature and distribution (in particular, the role of semantic and frequency-based constraints) are not empirically supported.

On the grammatical side, the encoding of too many distinctions is manifested in the proliferation of lexically peculiar inflectional exponence. The clearest instance of this is seen in inflection class distinctions (Corbett 2009), where morphological realisation of inflectional features is different across different (sets of) lexical items – most canonically where this is completely arbitrary, unaffiliated with any other semantic, morphological or phonological properties. In this sense inflection class represents a purely morphological feature (Corbett and Baerman 2006) whose role is restricted to the distribution of morphological forms, unrelated to their meaning or function. Deponency, at least in its original guise, involves lexemes whose morphology is perfectly normal but has been derailed from its usual function (Corbett 2007b). For example, the Latin verb mīrātur ‘admires’ looks like a passive verb that ought to mean something like ‘is admired’, given the prevailing morphological regularities in the system, but instead behaves like an ordinary active transitive.

### 1.2.2 Compositional Inconsistency in Paradigms

One of the guiding notions behind our conception of how paradigms are composed is that they should be internally consistent. The identification of the morphological components of a word form depends on this assumption, with morphemes, formatives and position classes as a result; morphological zeros are a poignant reminder of thwarted expectations, either morphosyntactic (in the case of zero affixes) or lexical (in the case of zero roots; Comrie and Zamponi, this volume). Compositional inconsistency can take many forms, but perhaps the most extreme example is the use of periphrastic constructions in a paradigm otherwise characterised by synthetic inflected forms (Corbett 2012b). It is precisely the expectation of paradigmatic consistency which encourages the identification of a multiword expression – which might otherwise be understood as syntactically constructed – as an inflected form.

Equally, morphosyntactic features lend themselves to being understood as cross-classifying, leading to the expectation that every form in a paradigm is somehow responsible for declaring where it stands in relation to every single feature expressed anywhere in the paradigm. This leads to a continual tension between analyses which maintain featural consistency and thereby tolerate what might be seen as frivolous syncretism (do all past tense verbs in English syncretise the 3sg value found in the present?), and those which allow different feature systems to operate in different parts of the paradigm (the English past tense simply does not care about the 3sg). While such configurations may lead to a reframing of the system of features, a more catastrophic instance of inconsistency occurs in cases of defectiveness (Baerman and Corbett 2010), where the very expectation that there be a form at all is not met, leaving a gap in the paradigm. That said, the expectation that all lexemes belonging to the
same part of speech should have the same paradigm shape is itself open to dispute, as discussed by Bonami and Boyé (this volume).

1.2.3 Conditions on Paradigms

The typology of mismatches sketched above assumes, quite intentionally, a static and mechanical mapping between morphosyntax and morphology, since the aim is a consistent characterisation of the deviations between a baseline model of inflection and the actual paradigms we encounter in languages. But a more nuanced approach to inflectional description will recognise that morphological realisation is mediated by further conditions that skew the mapping (Corbett 2006; Baerman et al. 2017). Various properties of the inflecting lexeme – phonological, morphological, semantic – influence the expression of morphosyntactic features, so that an inflectional rule when fully analysed may come to resemble a decision tree more than a simple mapping relationship. Consequently, there is no general consensus as to where exactly such conditions fit in the architecture of inflectional rules: are they an integral component, or just an annotation?

The tension between rules and conditions becomes particularly apparent when both appear to draw upon what are arguably inflectional features. For example, in a pattern repeated across a number of unrelated languages, the realisation of gender and number is conditioned by values of person (Chumakina et al. 2007; Baerman and Corbett 2013). Thus, in Tucano (a Tucanoan language of Columbia), there is no explicit person agreement on the verb, only gender and number agreement (West and Welch 2004). But only third person subjects actually distinguish these features, while first and second person subjects share a single form with the neuter. The end effect is a limited system of person marking as manifested through conditions on gender and number agreement: animate subjects take the semantically appropriate gender and number form if third person, but the neuter form if first and second person. Bond (this volume), explores further dimensions of this question in Kulina, a language of Peru, which has the further wrinkle that there are only two genders, masculine and feminine, with feminine serving as the default.

1.3 A Defaults Perspective

Compared with syntax and phonology, the world of morphology can be a daunting one. In this realm of ambiguity, irregularity and exception, often the result of historical change, it can be challenging to locate the system that both holds this world together and interfaces with syntax, phonology and semantics. Round (this volume) offers an extreme example of how historical developments in Kayardild have led to a typologically unusual personal agreement system, an instance of a linguistic ‘rarum’. Forcing morphological phenomena into the highly systematic realm of syntax, the approach taken by Distributed Morphology, for example, often turns out to be overly optimistic or overly artificial; most languages resist, though some do not. For instance, Chumakina (this volume) presents two exponents in Archei with highly syntactic behaviour, i.e. they appear to have their own argument structure, like
lexemes. One avenue into this partially systematic world is to take a defaults perspective on morphology. This is an avenue that has been well travelled by Corbett and others, and has led to insights on generalisations about inflection classes, the nature of morphological irregularity, the role of syncretism in morphological organisation, gender assignment, and morphology’s interface with syntax. Corbett’s journey began when he met Gerald Gazdar in 1988 who demonstrated a defaults-based lexical knowledge representation language. Together with Norman Fraser, Corbett put this language to use on Russian nominal morphology, yielding a ‘new perspective’ on familiar data (Corbett and Fraser 1993: 113). These are the foundations on which the theory of Network Morphology was built.¹

1.3.1 Inflection Classes

Inflection classes (see §1.2.1) are a means of regulating inflectional allomorphy. Some Latin noun inflection classes are given in Table 1.2, where the dative singular inflectional endings are highlighted.

Such a strategy has the disadvantage of concealing sameness in order to emphasise distinction. Thus, while most of the classes shown here have distinct exponents of the dative singular (-ae (aqua ‘water’), -ō (servō ‘slave’), -i (iūdic-i ‘judge’) and -ī (reī ‘thing’)), for two classes the dative singular is in fact the same: both classes 3 and 4 use -i: iūdici and frūctui. At least for this particular set of features there is no distinction between classes 3 and 4. On closer inspection a class 3/4 distinction disappears for other feature sets. Both use the same exponent for genitive plural (-um), dative plural (-ibus), and ablative plural (-ibus). Other instances of inter-class sharing also take place; for example, classes 1 and 2 have the same dative plural forms: -īs. To

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aqua</td>
<td>servus</td>
<td>iūdecs</td>
<td>frūctus</td>
<td>rēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘water’</td>
<td>‘slave’</td>
<td>‘judge’</td>
<td>‘fruit’</td>
<td>‘thing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATIVE</td>
<td>aqua</td>
<td>servus</td>
<td>iūdecs</td>
<td>frūctus</td>
<td>rēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENITIVE</td>
<td>aquae</td>
<td>servī</td>
<td>iūdicī</td>
<td>frūctūs</td>
<td>reī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td>aquae</td>
<td>servō</td>
<td>iūdicī</td>
<td>frūctui</td>
<td>reī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUSATIVE</td>
<td>aquam</td>
<td>servum</td>
<td>iūdicem</td>
<td>frūctum</td>
<td>rem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLATIVE</td>
<td>aquā</td>
<td>servō</td>
<td>iūdice</td>
<td>frūctū</td>
<td>rē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATIVE</td>
<td>aquae</td>
<td>servī</td>
<td>iūdicēs</td>
<td>frūctūs</td>
<td>rēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENITIVE</td>
<td>aquārum</td>
<td>servōrum</td>
<td>iūdicum</td>
<td>frūctum</td>
<td>rērum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td>aquūs</td>
<td>servīs</td>
<td>iūdicibus</td>
<td>frūctibus</td>
<td>rēbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUSATIVE</td>
<td>aquās</td>
<td>servōs</td>
<td>iūdicēs</td>
<td>frūctūs</td>
<td>rēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLATIVE</td>
<td>aquīs</td>
<td>servīs</td>
<td>iūdicibus</td>
<td>frūctibus</td>
<td>rēbus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
capture sharing and distinction, the information registered in inflection classes can be reorganised into a network of nodes that are linked by inheritance. The Latin data in Table 1.2 can be represented by the inheritance hierarchy in Figure 1.1.

The five classes in Figure 1.1 are viewed as nodes that inherit from a single source NOUN. While there are distinctions between the classes, all share properties that can be stated as inheritable facts placed at the root node: the part of speech in question is noun, specifically they are count nouns, and their primitive semantics is ‘thing’ in the sense of Jackendoff (1975), for example. The sharing of exponents by classes 3 and 4 is captured by holding this information at the abstraction node N_3_4 that provides a source of inheritance for classes 3 and 4. A node abstracting common information from the neuter (class IV) and masculine (class I) nodes in Russian was used in the Russian noun class analysis in Corbett and Fraser (1993). Distinction and sameness was nicely summarised as: ‘Looking down from the top, Russian has three noun declensional classes . . . looking up from the bottom it has four . . .’ (Corbett

Another exponent that is shared by different classes is -(i)bus for the dative plural: classes 3, 4 and 5. Rather than creating an abstraction node just for this exponent and just for these classes, we might want to think more in terms of probability: there is a three in five chance that the inflection class uses -(i)bus for its dative plural, or it is generally the case that a Latin noun inflectional class has -(i)bus for its dative plural. By interpreting inheritance between nodes as inheritance by default, such a generalisation can be expressed by situating this fact at the root node NOUN. Classes 3, 4 and 5 inherit it; classes 1 and 2 override it with their class-specific alternative. Using default inheritance, Corbett and Fraser captured the fact that generally the nominative plural for a Russian noun is in -i, among other generalisations.

Inheritance by default also recasts irregularity as semi-regularity. The Latin for ‘coin’ nummus behaves like a typical class 2 noun except that its genitive plural is nummum instead of the expected nummōrum. Rather than thinking of the noun as irregular, Network Morphology treats it as semi-regular by situating it in the inheritance path of the class 1 node, and simply overriding the realisation of the genitive plural. A regular lexical entry is given in (1), which can be compared with the irregular (2). A network organisation of nodes connected via default inheritance minimises the differences.

(1) Servus
   class ← N_2
   stem = serv
   gloss = slave

(2) Nummus
   class ← N_2
   stem = numm
   gloss = coin
   {CASE: GEN, NUMBER: PLURAL} = /stem + um/

As shown in Corbett and Fraser for Russian and subsequent work for other languages, a defaults inheritance approach to irregularity correlates number of overrides with degree of regularity, thus getting at the nature of the item’s irregularity.

In fact, (2) misses a generalisation because it introduces redundancy into the system. A defaults-based network aims to reduce or even eliminate redundancy altogether. The alternative -um exponent that nummus chooses to use is not exclusive to nummus: it appears elsewhere in the network, namely as a fact situated at N_3_4. Through default orthogonal multiple inheritance, a node can plug into the network through multiple nodes. The more redundant-free representation of nummus is given in (3) reducing further its irregularity by viewing it as a case of mild heteroclossis.
(3) Nummus
   class ← N_2 [primary source of inheritance]
   stem = numm
   gloss = coin
   {case: gen, number: plural} ← N_3_4 [secondary source of inheritance]

1.3.2 Syncretism

While inflection classes regulate choices of exponents, Latin, as with many languages, is characterised by a lack of any choice in some instances. In class 2, the dative singular and the ablative singular share the same exponent -ō. It is as if there is no exponent for the dative; instead it has to ‘borrow’ from the ablative (or, of course, the other way around). A defaults-based network representation of inflectional classes captures exponent sharing in the spirit of reducing redundancy, and in this way offers an account of syncretism (see §1.2.1). Instead of stating the exponent twice, an intra-node referral is made in the node representing N_2.

(4) N_2
   class ← NOUN
   {case: dat, number: sing} ← {case: abl, number: sing}
   case: abl, number: sing} = /stem + o/

DATR, the lexical knowledge representation language that Corbett and Fraser adopted, expresses the situation in (4) as in (5).2

(5) N_2:
   <> == NOUN
   <sg dat> == “<sg abl>”
   <sg abl> == “<stem>” o
   ...

   The ellipsis indicates that there are a lot more facts that are registered at N_2, i.e. all the other case and number combinations.

   Being able to point to different parts of the network for already available information allows for a natural account of directional syncretism, where the pointing expresses a rule of referral (Zwicky 1985; Stump 1993; 2001: 212–41). Of course, there should be some observable motivation for positing a particular directionality. Arguing for the dative pointing to the ablative, rather than the other way around, could be based on the fact that in the singular the dative shares an exponent with the genitive (class 1), the ablative (class 2) and the genitive (class 5), whereas the ablative has its own exponent for all classes except for class 2. A stronger argument for the link between dative and ablative can be made by looking at the situation in the plural. In all classes the dative and ablative exponents are shared. While the actual exponents themselves differ to some extent across the classes, the relationship is common to all. Generalised syncretisms are naturally captured as facts stated at a higher node, in this instance the highest node NOUN, as in (6).
The target of the syncretism is represented in quotes, meaning ‘whatever exponent you find for the plural ablative, use that’. The systematic nature of the animate genitive–accusative syncretism in Russian has been captured in this way, from Corbett and Fraser (1993) onwards.

A now famous case for the necessity of a rule of referral in some circumstances was made by Corbett based on data from Slovene (i.e. Corbett and Fraser 1997; Baerman et al. 2005: 176). In nouns, the genitive and locative dual are always identical to the genitive and locative plural, from which one might conclude that it would be impossible to isolate any directionality. However, the paradigm of the noun ‘person’, illustrated in Table 1.3, provides evidence in the form of suppletion: for most of the paradigm, singular and dual share a stem (človek-) opposed to a plural stem (ljud-). But in the genitive and locative, this otherwise plural stem is also found in the dual, suggesting that it can only be described by a rule referring the dual genitive to the plural genitive, and the dual locative to the plural locative. Moreover, this directionality is in fact generalisable for Slovene demonstrative pronouns and adjectives (Priestly 1993: 410, 411).

A rule of referral is not always the optimal analysis of a syncretism. A better analysis can be feature neutralisation. For instance, Lower Sorbian adjectives such as dobry ‘good’ clearly distinguish three genders in the singular, yet masculine, feminine and neuter adjectives in the nominative case share the same exponent in the plural, as shown in Table 1.4. It is less intuitive to use rules of referral to account for this, than to simply think of the gender feature being neutralised in plural contexts. As the syncretism occurs in all cases, not just the nominative, neutralisation is the favoured analysis.

Neutralisation of gender distinctions is formally captured in DATR, by ordering the attributes in a path that denotes the feature values of a word form (see §1.2.2, allowing a different feature system to operate in a different part of the paradigm). Neutralisation of gender in the plural is captured by the ordered attribute paths in (7), where number precedes case, and both precede gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMINATIVE</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>človek</td>
<td>človeka</td>
<td>ljudje</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCUSATIVE</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>človeka</td>
<td>človeka</td>
<td>ljudi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENITIVE</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>človeka</td>
<td>ljudi</td>
<td>ljudi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATIVE</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>človeku</td>
<td>človekoma</td>
<td>ljudem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENTAL</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>človekom</td>
<td>človekoma</td>
<td>ljudmi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATIVE</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>človeku</td>
<td>ljudeh</td>
<td>ljudeh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.4 Paradigm of the Lower Sorbian adjective *dobry* ‘good’ (Starosta 1999: 35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MASUCINE</td>
<td>FEMININE</td>
<td>NEUTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATIVE</td>
<td>dobry</td>
<td>dobra</td>
<td>dobre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUSATIVE</td>
<td>dobry</td>
<td>dobru</td>
<td>dobre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENITIVE</td>
<td>dobrego</td>
<td>dobreje</td>
<td>dobrego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td>dobremu</td>
<td>dobrej</td>
<td>dobremu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUMENTAL</td>
<td>dobrym</td>
<td>dobreju</td>
<td>dobrym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATIVE</td>
<td>dobrem</td>
<td>dobrej</td>
<td>dobrem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) \(<pl \text{ nom}> = "<stem>" e \)<br>
\(<pl \text{ gen}> = "<stem>" ych\)<br>etc.

An attribute path representing a morphosyntactic feature set implies any extension of itself by one or more attributes. For example, \(<pl \text{ nom}>\) implies \(<pl \text{ nom fem}>\). This implication captures observed cases of feature underspecification. In fact, this implication holds by default. It means we can also take a neutralisation approach where there is syncretism between the masculine and neuter case forms in the singular in Table 1.4. This is first captured by the generalisation in (8).

(8) \(<sg \text{ gen}> = "<stem>" \text{ ego}\)<br>
\(<sg \text{ dat}> = "<stem>" \text{ emu}\)<br>etc.

Where there is no syncretism, the implied value is overridden by a more specific path, of the type in (9).

(9) \(<sg \text{ gen fem}> = "<stem>" \text{ eje}\)<br>
\(<sg \text{ dat fem}> = "<stem>" \text{ ej}\)<br>etc.

Neutralisation syncretism formally modelled as ‘longest path wins’, i.e. Pāṇini style default inference, originates in Corbett and Fraser’s (1993) account of Russian, with additional detail in Baerman et al. (2005: ch. 5), and in other subsequent work.\(^4\) Contexts for such neutralisation have been thoroughly investigated from a cross-linguistic perspective and are reported in Baerman et al. (2002), and discussed in Brown et al. (2009) and Brown and Hippisley (2012: 165–6).

1.3.3 Gender Assignment

The inflection class nodes in Figure 1.1 inherit shareable information, hold class-specific information and serve as a source of inheritance for lexical entries. Nouns in Latin have gender: masculine, feminine and neuter. Each of the classes in Figure 1.1 is strongly associated with a gender, for example class 1 with feminine nouns and
To capture class-based gender, we could add the fact \(<\text{gender}>=\text{masc}\) to \(N_1\). A similar situation holds for Russian, and in the DATR analysis in Corbett and Fraser (1993) gender assignment is captured as inheritance of the feature from the inflection class nodes. Thus, default inheritance is used to express Corbett’s longstanding claim that in Russian (as in many languages) inflection classes assign gender (Corbett 1982, 1988; 1991: 36–43). The often-advanced alternative, gender as the determiner of inflection class, leads to a much less economical analysis. Since there are more inflection classes than gender, every noun that could not be categorised according to the biological sex of its referent would have to be lexically specified for both gender and inflection class. In Corbett’s analysis you just need to specify inflection class. However, the Latin noun \(\text{agricola} \) ‘farmer’ is a little odd as it declines like a regular class 1 noun but controls masculine rather than feminine agreement. Some nouns in Russian are exceptional in the same way. Corbett has claimed that languages can have a predominantly formal system of gender assignment but all gender systems have a semantic core albeit with complex interactions. For example, in Bininj Gun-wok, a language of the Gunwinyguan family spoken in central Arnhem Land in Australia’s Northern Territory, assignment is essentially animacy-based with highly complex interactions with other features and conditions (Evans et al. 2002). Semantic assignment, i.e. male means masculine, always take precedence (see Bond, this volume, on gender assignment for Kulina nouns). In Corbett (1991: 36–7) this is captured by rule ordering and diagrammed as a flow chart. In Corbett and Fraser (1993) the same claim is captured declaratively, using defaults: by default, the gender value inherited from the class is the one used in syntax; this is overridden by a semantic value assigned due to biological sex.

This of course underscores the importance of defaults for capturing the general situation while allowing for exceptions, and the advantage of a declarative over a procedural approach. It also results in two types of gender feature evaluation: class-based formal gender, and one based on semantics. They normally coincide; or by default they coincide. But in cases like \(\text{agricola}\), they can be at odds. In Corbett and Fraser (1993) and all subsequent Network Morphology analyses, a formal distinction is made between the machinery of morphology and syntax by labelling each path that states a morphological fact with the attribute mor. So the accusative singular for class 1 is expressed as \(<\text{mor sg acc}>=\text{“<stem>” am}\). For \(\text{agricola}\) the gender inheritable from class 1 is therefore \(<\text{mor gender}>=\text{fem}\); but the gender used for syntax is \(<\text{syn gender}>=\text{masc}\). The default that the two attribute paths have the same value is neatly expressed as \(<\text{syn gender}>=<\text{mor gender}\). Because it is a default, for sex-differentiable nouns like \(\text{agricola}\), the evaluation of \(<\text{syn gender}\) can be made elsewhere, i.e. based on semantic sex. These ideas are further developed in Fraser and Corbett (1995, 1997) and Corbett and Fraser (2000).

### 1.3.4 The Morphology–Syntax Interface

The gender values inherited from the morphological hierarchy and the gender values that syntax cares about (expressed in DATR as \(<\text{mor gender}>=<\text{syn gender}\)), are
equivalent by default, yet their autonomous status in the formal architecture captures the important insight that this is not always the case. Morphology is a semi-autonomous system that can be at work on purely organisational problems that have little or nothing to do with syntax (the notion of purely morphological features introduced in §1.2.1). Morphology often serves syntax, but not always in a direct way.

By way of example, consider the non-syntactic roles of gender values in Russian, which guide the choice of derivational operations in Russian evaluative morphology (Hippisley 1996), and derivational operations in possessive adjective formation (Corbett 1987; Hippisley 1996). It can be classified as a ‘pure’ morphological feature (Corbett and Baerman 2006; Corbett 2012a). Stem indexes, theme vowels and stress indexes in Russian (Brown et al. 1996) are other examples of features that seem to have little purpose beyond morphology, and all are represented as extensions of the path <mor>. Separating the morphological world from the syntactic world provides for the possibility of other disconnects besides gender based on semantics and gender based on inflection class. For example, deponency in Latin, where verb forms that resemble passives in morphological terms have a syntactically active interpretation (see §1.2.1), constitutes a classic mismatch between the two worlds. Such a mismatch is captured naturally by <mor> paths, as exemplified by (10), based on Hippisley (2010) and Brown and Hippisley (2012: ch. 5).

(10) DEPONENT:
    <> == VERB
    <mor active> == “<mor passive>”

A defaults approach thus provides for the notion of autonomous morphology and the various mismatches that result from juxtaposing it with syntax to be formalised in a simple and intuitively satisfying way.

1.4 A Canonical Perspective

One of the key areas where Corbett’s work has had considerable impact is the way in which linguists look beyond the surface, and beyond the most frequently attested patterns, to consider not only what we are familiar with, but also what could be.

1.4.1 Features

If words are the basic building blocks of syntax, then feature values are the atoms of morphology. Features provide the means to explain properties shared across lexical items and capture paradigmatic relations between word forms as well as syntactic relationships between constituents.

In much of Corbett’s work features have taken centre stage. Two of his monographs discuss specific features in extensive detail, namely Gender (Corbett 1991) and Number (Corbett 2000). A third, Features (Corbett 2012a), provides a broad perspective on what a well-developed theory of features must contend with. In these works, and many others, the diversity of linguistic systems and the principles giving rise to the morphological expression of feature values are systematically dissected,
allowing many important insights that can only be revealed in this way (Corbett 1981, 1999, 2010a; see also papers in Kibort and Corbett 2010).

While various analyses of feature structures have been proposed, the most widely accepted variety function as an attribute with two or more mutually exclusive values, which may or may not exhibit internal structure (Corbett 2012a). The values of a given feature differ across languages. In languages with case, values can range from just two, to close to twenty, with the exact number dependent on how they are counted (Comrie and Polinsky 1998; Iggesen 2005, 2013). The emergence or loss of values of a feature may have profound effects on how the morphological system operates, as argued by Krasovitsky (this volume) with respect to the loss of case values in Bulgarian dialects.

In gender systems, a similar amount of variation is observed in the number of possible feature values attested (Corbett 2005, 2013a), but determining the number of values a feature has is not always straightforward, especially since values may be non-autonomous, or indirectly observable (Chumakina et al. 2007; Corbett 2008; Baerman and Corbett 2013). In languages which appear to have more than one gender feature, the principles for determining the number of values in a system are even more complex (Fedden and Corbett 2017).

Features can also be typologised on the basis of the modules of grammar in which they are operational. Morphosyntactic features are those that are relevant for both morphology (in the formation of word forms) and syntax (through operations such as government and agreement). This apparently finite set of features comprises person, number, gender and case, and less commonly definiteness and respect (Corbett 2006). The most canonical features are morphosyntactic, since these have the widest possible distribution across word forms and have the greatest potential for orthogonality (Corbett 2013b), but other types of feature are found as well.

Meaningful features that typically do not participate in morphosyntactic processes, such as tense and aspect, are morphosemantic. They are relevant to morphology and to semantics, but not syntax. Others are strictly morphological, such as inflection class (§1.2.1, §1.3.4).

Some features, such as number, can be either morphosyntactic or morphosemantic, depending on their distribution in a language. This gives rise to a wide range of possible morphological number systems (Corbett 2000; and see both Baerman and Evans, this volume, for some particularly challenging data). Features that are usually morphosemantic do occasionally come to participate in syntax. Such is the case with nominal tense. Nikolaeva (this volume) examines evidence that suggests that focus belongs to the set of features that are typically morphosemantic, yet occasionally morphosyntactic.

Another important property of features concerns the internal structure of their values. For instance, values can be hierarchically arranged to make sense of the contrasts most regularly observed in number systems (see Corbett 2000). Hierarchical relationships between values can also be observed when they are undergoing a neutralisation process. This is illustrated here with discussion of data from Jingulu,
a non-Pama-Nyungan language described by Pensalfini (2003) and discussed in Corbett (2012a: 22–5). Jingulu has four genders (masculine, feminine, vegetable and neuter), demonstrable through agreement. However, in some circumstances, the genders are ‘superclassed’ such that masculine and feminine controllers pattern together to take masculine agreements, while vegetable and neuter controllers pattern together to take neuter agreements. For instance, a noun in the vegetable gender can take a demonstrative that agrees with its vegetable value (11a), or its superclass value, i.e. neuter (11b). This is a facultative feature, in that an alternation is available.

(11) Jingulu (Corbett 2012a: 23)
   a. ngimaniki barndumi  
      this.VEG lower.back(VEG)
   b. ngininiki barndumi
      this.N  lower.back(VEG)

   ‘this lower back’  ‘this lower back’

Additional evidence demonstrates that masculine is the ultimate default for agreement, such that both vegetable and neuter nouns can also take masculine agreements, while feminine nouns can only take feminine or masculine. This structure is represented in Figure 1.2.

The view that not all feature values have equal status pervades Corbett’s oeuvre. The possibility of an asymmetry is central to accounts of defaults (§1.2), non-autonomous feature values, and the ways in which mismatches are resolved through agreement.

1.4.2 Agreement

Agreement is typically thought of as a syntactic relation, operational within a well-defined set of domains. Corbett’s (1983, 2003a, 2003b, 2006) work on agreement sets out the core concepts central to describing agreement relations (controller, target, domain), the features that participate in agreement (the ‘phi’ features, case, plus

![Figure 1.2 Gender superclassing in Jingulu (Corbett 2012a: 24)](image-url)
some more marginal morphosyntactic features) and conditions on agreement. His perspective on the issue provides a working method for examining agreement relations on empirical grounds, in order to better understand deviations from what is formalised in theoretical models of syntax. These themes are carried forward in many of the contributions to this volume. For instance, Fedden (this volume) surveys the properties of aberrant targets – those that do not agree, while others of the same class do. Bond (this volume), examines the role of features in a system of agreement that permits controllers that do not function as arguments of the clause. Polinsky (this volume) examines the Russian generic pronoun ty as a target for syntactic agreement mismatch with controller due to the semantic considerations of binding.

One area where Corbett’s work on agreement has been most influential is in highlighting the distinction between syntactic and semantic agreement. Consider the British English examples in (12) based on Corbett (1979), especially the key data point in (12c). In these examples a contrast is observed between syntactic agreement in number between the subject and the predicate, as in (12a,b), and semantic agreement between a formally singular but semantically ‘plural’ controller, as in (12c). The opposite pattern is not grammatical, as shown in (12d).

(12) a. The committee has decided.
    b. The committees have decided.
    c. The committee have decided.
    d. *The committees has decided.

While predicates can behave in this way, within the nominal domain of British English, semantic agreement is not permitted, as shown in (13).

(13) a. This committee
    b. *These committee

Observation of this kind led to the formulation of a hierarchy with predictive power, known as the Agreement Hierarchy, shown in (14).

(14) The Agreement Hierarchy (Corbett 1979)
    attributive > predicate > relative pronoun > personal pronoun

The Agreement Hierarchy connects together a series of related implicational statements about the agreement domains in which semantic agreement is permitted. It claims that if semantic agreement is possible with a given (type of) target ranked on the hierarchy, it will also be possible with the targets to the right.

The leftmost agreement targets on the hierarchy – those in the ‘attributive position’ – are the most syntactically conservative. They are more resistant to permitting semantic agreement than targets in other domains. Personal pronouns, at the right edge, are the most susceptible to interference from the semantic properties of their antecedent.

The reach of the Agreement Hierarchy can be also seen with syntactically complex controllers such as French ton phénomène de fille ‘your amazing daughter’
(lit. ‘your phenomenon of a daughter’). Here there is a misalignment between the syntactic and semantic heads. The first noun (masculine phénomène ‘phenomenon’) is the syntactic head of the nominal. The semantic head, the element governing the selectional restrictions, is the second component (feminine fille ‘daughter’). The fact that the second component in structures of this kind has some (semantic) head properties gives rise to agreement mismatches, as shown by the French examples in (15) and (16).

(15) French (Hulk and Tellier 1999: 183)

\[
\text{Ton phénomène de fille est bien distrait-e.}
\]

‘That amazing daughter of yours is quite absent-minded.’

In (15), the syntactic head of the subject is inanimate and masculine, yet the entire phrase makes reference to a person, and the semantic head is fille ‘daughter’. This mismatch has an impact on the syntax. The attributive modifier ton ‘your’, which is masculine singular, agrees with the syntactic head; agreeing with the semantic head is not acceptable (cf. *ta (f)). The predicate on the other hand agrees with the gender value of fille ‘daughter’; agreement with the syntactic head is unacceptable (cf. *distrait (m)). The Agreement Hierarchy in (14) predicts that since semantic agreement is observed with predicate targets, it should also be possible with relative pronouns and personal pronouns. Agreement is understood in its broadest sense here, i.e. that it ranges from NP-internal agreement to antecedent–anaphor relations (Corbett 2006: 21–3).

(16) French (Corbett 2016)

\[
\text{Ton phénomène de fille, avec laquelle je viens de parler . . . Elle . . .}
\]

‘That amazing daughter of yours, with whom I have just been speaking . . . She . . .’

In (16), the relative pronoun agrees with the semantic head, as does the personal pronoun (the masculine forms *lequel and *il are not acceptable). Thus, we find a pattern of syntactic agreement in attributive position, and semantic agreement elsewhere, a pattern fully in accord with the Agreement Hierarchy. 6

The hierarchy monotonically predicts that if any language exhibits semantic agreement between an attributive modifier and its head, then semantic agreement will also be observed on predicates. It provides an empirically justified set of constraints on the domains in which morphosyntactic and ‘semantic’ features are operational.

Another area where semantic agreement is operational is in gender resolution. Resolution rules come into play when the gender specification of a syntactically
complex controller needs to be computed. For instance, in Slovene, when the subject of a predicate comprises two conjoined noun phrases with heads belonging to different genders, as in (17), the gender clash is resolved by resorting to masculine agreement on the predicate. Number, on the other hand, is computed, such that when two singular noun phrases are coordinated, agreement is dual, not singular.

(17) Slovene (Corbett 2006: 238)

\[
\text{Oče in mati sta me obiska-l-a} \\
\text{father(M)[SG] and mother(F)[SG] aux.3du 1SG.ACC visit-pst-M.du}
\]

‘(My) father and mother visited me.’

If agreement with the gender and number of the subject were purely syntactic, we would expect agreement with the closest conjunct of the coordinated subject.

When there is no gender clash, resolution is as we might expect; if both co-ordinands have masculine gender, the predicate is masculine. Similarly, when both co-ordinands are feminine, the predicate bears feminine agreement. However, when the two conjoined noun phrases are both neuter, a somewhat unexpected situation arises. Conjoined neuter noun phrases control masculine agreement, as in (18). Number, on the other hand, is computed, resulting in plural agreement.


\[
\text{Dv-e telet-i in en-o žrebe so bi-l-i zunaj} \\
\text{two-N calf(N)-DU and one-N.SG foal.N[SG] aux.3pl be-pst-M.pl outside}
\]

‘Two calves and a foal were outside.’

So why does Slovene behave in this way? Building on his earlier work (Corbett 1991, 2003c), and that of Weschler and Zlatić (2003), Corbett (2006) argues that in languages like Slovene, where assignment to a particular gender may be semantic or formal in nature (cf. languages where gender assignment is purely semantic), formal resolution rules can be ‘piggy-backed’ on semantic resolution rules. For Slovene, he proposes the resolution rules in (19) (Corbett 2006: 261).

(19) a. If all conjuncts refer to female humans, agreement is feminine.
    b. If all conjuncts refer to humans, whether all male or mixed sexes, agreement is masculine.

In his proposal, the formal resolution rules in (19) that apply to non-humans, including the neuter animates, result from the appropriation of semantic rules into the formal domain. One appealing aspect of this account is that it provides a coherent approach to all types of gender resolution, because even those systems which appear to be highly constrained by formal features have semantics at the core of their resolution rules. Since gender resolution is partly motivated by semantics, even in a system like Slovene, gender resolution adheres to the Agreement Hierarchy in (14); the larger the agreement domain, the more likely that gender resolution rules apply.
1.4.3 Canonical Typology

Corbett’s typological approach to dissecting the complexities of morphological systems ultimately led to the birth of a new approach to defining linguistic phenomena: Canonical Typology (Corbett 2003a, 2003b, 2005, 2006, 2007a, 2009, among others). The primary objective of this enterprise is to be able to calibrate the differences between the ‘clearest, best’ instances of a linguistic phenomenon, together with those that share some, but not all the properties of the ‘indisputable’ cases.

In Canonical Typology fine-grained parameters of typological variation are distinguished as independent variables with two or more ordered values. One of these values is considered ‘canonical’ while the others are non-canonical. For instance, consider the criterion in (20), from Corbett’s (2006: 19–23) discussion of the canonical domains for agreement, in which a local domain for agreement is considered canonical.

\[(20) \text{local domain} > \text{non-local domain}\]

This criterion captures the observation that the smaller the structural distance between the controller and the target, the more likely that syntactic agreement, rather than semantic agreement, will be operational. Together, a series of criteria provide a framework for comparing attested instances of a phenomenon against a hypothetical and idealised benchmark. This is known as the canon.

Canonical Typology was first developed as a means to systematically analyse morphosyntactic and morphological phenomena, such as agreement and inflection (Corbett 2003a, 2003b, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2015), as well as derivation (Corbett 2010b) and compounding (Spencer, this volume), but has been widely applied within and beyond these initial domains (see papers in Brown et al. 2013 and Fedden et al. 2018, as well as references in Bond 2018).

Within the framework, canonical inflection is determined by a series of properties that identify canonical paradigmatic relationships (see §1.2.1). Here, we will consider just three criteria identified at various points by Corbett (2005, 2007a, 2007b, 2009). Based on criteria discussed in these works, the following set of clines can be distilled (see Bond 2018 for detailed discussion). The canonical property for each criterion is on the left, whereas the non-canonical property is on the right.

\[(21) \text{A canonical inflectional paradigm is:}\]
\[\text{Criterion 1: Exhaustive} > \text{Non-exhaustive}\]
\[\text{Criterion 2: Complete} > \text{Incomplete}\]
\[\text{Criterion 3: Unambiguous} > \text{Ambiguous}\]

In an exhaustive paradigm, every logically compatible combination of values of the morphosyntactic features relevant for a given item defines a cell in its paradigm. For instance, consider a paradigm in which the relevant features are number (singular, plural) and gender (masculine, feminine, neuter). If these feature values are maximally orthogonal, this results in a 2 x 3 matrix with a maximal set of
six cells as in the logically exhaustive paradigm in Table 1.5. In a non-exhaustive paradigm, certain logically possible distinctions are not made, and lexical splits are observed (Corbett 2015). This is the case in the non-exhaustive paradigm in Table 1.6.

Table 1.5 Exhaustive paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exhaustivity of a lexeme’s paradigm can be determined only by comparing paradigms of different lexical items with the same syntactic distribution.

The properties of the paradigm with respect to completeness are interpretable with respect to the number of cells defined (i.e., with respect to the exhaustivity of a paradigm). Assuming that for some lexical items it is possible to define six cells, a paradigm which has a form associated with each of its cells is complete, as in Table 1.7. An incomplete paradigm is defective, as in Table 1.8.

Table 1.7 Complete paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>x1</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an unambiguous paradigm, each cell contains a distinct form, as in Table 1.9. A paradigm without a distinct form in each of its cells is ambiguous because some cells share a form, resulting in syncretism or a morphomic pattern, as in Table 1.10.

Table 1.9 Unambiguous paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.10 Ambiguous paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only do these parameters allow us to explicitly calibrate the ways in which the paradigms of individual lexemes deviate from the canon, they provide an opportunity to explore the ways in which parameters cluster together. Thornton (this volume)
provides a nice case study of how these considerations play out in the inflectional morphology of a single language, Italian.

The multivariate nature of the canonical approach to cross-linguistic research is echoed in works of many other scholars (Haspelmath 2007; Hyman 2009; Bickel 2010, 2011). As in Canonical Typology, they advocate making observations on a large number of empirically motivated variables to gauge the similarities and differences between linguistic structures (within or across languages).  

1.5 Outline of the Book

For much of linguistic theory the role of the word is simply that of a repository of lexical semantics and a vehicle for syntactic operations. In a canonical linguistic system that would be all we would need to say about morphology. In practice though, it does not work this way: morphology has a structure and logic of its own, often enough running counter to what would seem to be the requirements of an optimal system. This book places morphology at the centre of its research agenda, both as an independent component of language and as a starting point for explorations into all aspects of language. The book sets out three main morphological perspectives: the mapping of form to feature, the organisation of word forms into paradigms, and marking syntactic dependencies. Each of these perspectives pinpoints various serious challenges that morphology throws down for linguistic description.

1.5.1 Form–Feature Mapping

Corbett (2009) defines canonical inflection in terms of the tension between inflectional and lexical material within word forms: inflectional material is different across the cells of a paradigm, but the same across lexemes, while lexical material is the same across the cells of a paradigm but different across lexemes. Canonical inflection is thus a one-to-one mapping between morphosyntactic feature values and morphological formatives which is consistent across the lexicon. Of course, this idealised configuration is rarely, if ever, found in natural language, and it is the deviations which are the stuff of morphological theory: without them, morphology would just be a notational variant of syntax. The resulting mismatches between linguistic features and their morphological expression is the topic of this part. Spencer takes one of the clearest cases – the juxtaposition of multiple independent words into a compound word with a single meaning – and subjects it to an analysis in terms of Canonical Typology, tracing the different threads of what turns out to be a complex and diverse phenomenon. Thornton follows the same approach within the domain of the inflectional morphology of Italian, classifying different varieties of non-canonical inflectional phenomena and locating them within the larger context of inflectional typology. The Papuan language described by Evans displays what he calls distributed deponency, where morphological formatives already in use in the system are repurposed in novel combinations to express additional functions. Baerman attempts to reconcile the parallel but disjointed semantic and morphological paradigms in a Yuman language, whose morphological formatives approach meaning without being
fully deterministic. Aronoff offers a cautionary tale about the seductive appeal of elegant but deceptive abstractions in the interpretation of morphological patterns. Finally, Nichols pushes the limits of a canonical approach to inflection through a series of phenomena that seem to fall in-between the cracks, defying characterisation along any known parameters.

### 1.5.2 Words and Paradigms

Inflectional morphology furnishes the set of word forms that belong to a lexeme’s paradigm. This process entails a number of system-level ‘constants’, and each one of these is shown to be wobbly in the chapters in Part II. First the set of cells that partition the feature space that morphology fills is expected to be constant across lexemes. If the partition is due to a distinction in gender features for some lexemes, then a gender-based shape should characterise the paradigms of all lexemes. Bonami and Boyé’s study of French common gender nouns is presented as evidence that paradigm uniformity is not a given. Non-uniformity of paradigms is perhaps more expected across dialects as a result of variation in the historical trajectories of paradigmatic reorganisation. As an example of this Krasovitsky presents the loss of case features in Bulgarian, with the various dialects showing its greater or lesser preservation in personal pronoun paradigms where person and number features appear to exert different degrees of influence on the outcome. Looking within the paradigm itself, there are certain expectations about the structure of the word forms that fill the cells. The stem stays constant; what is added to it varies. This notion is turned on its head in Palancar’s account of morphomic stems in Spanish verbs where such multi-stem behaviour is shown to heavily impact the complexity of the morphological system. Our expectations of possible systems are further challenged by Comrie and Zamponi. They discuss the case of verb root ellipsis in Inuktitut, Kwaza and Great Andamanese whereby the verb root is elided if retrievable by the discourse, but the exponents of morphological features remain. This context-based behaviour is contrasted with zero roots, a lexically specified phenomenon. While verb root ellipsis shows that boundedness of affixes cannot always be assumed, Chumakina’s examination of quotative and verficative markers in Archi shows that morphological exponents can have a syntactic independence, namely they can contain argument structure requirements that are normally associated with lexemes.

### 1.5.3 Syntactic Dependencies

The role of morphology in marking dependencies in syntax is far from straightforward. This problem underlies the development of the notion of canonical agreement (Corbett 2006), an archetype from which possible properties and behaviour of controllers, targets, domains, features and conditions involved in an agreement relation can be calibrated. The most interesting – and ultimately informative – examples of agreement are non-canonical in nature. They reveal something about the limits of language and how systems come to be, while providing compelling evidence for the ways in which morphology and syntax interface. In Fedden’s survey of ‘sporadic
agreement’, he proposes a typology of defective agreement targets – those items within a class of words that are expected to agree, but don’t – demonstrating that they belong to inflection classes that are shaped, but not defined, by a range of non-arbitrary factors. Bond discusses the role of non-syntactic conditions on agreement in Kulina, a language with two orthogonal gender systems. He argues that gender features and their values must be accessible to syntax not only via lexical entries or the content paradigm of word forms, but through their information structure descriptions too. Nikolaeva considers the nature of features involved in morphosyntactic processes in Tundra Nenets, proposing that a language may simultaneously exhibit a (run of the mill) morphosemantic focus feature, as well as a morphosyntactic one that participates in a syntactic operation that exhibits some properties of grammatical agreement. Polinsky provides evidence from Russian to support the view that the features relevant for binding may be either synchronised with or dissociated from the sets of values operational in agreement domains. Round argues that in typology, rara provide valuable test-cases for theoretical hypotheses, using the diachronic development of a non-canonical agreement pattern in the Australian language Kayardild to demonstrate that theory-building needs a historical perspective to succeed.

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to Tim Feist for helpful comments on a draft of this paper, and to Penny Everson, Lisa Mack and Gihyun Gal for help in the production of the volume.

Notes

1. For a monograph treatment of Network Morphology, see Brown and Hippisley (2012).
2. For a detailed description of DATR, see Evans and Gazdar (1996); Corbett and Fraser (1993).
3. The form of the masculine singular and dual forms is conditioned, such that modifiers of animate accusative masculine non-plural nouns use the genitive rather than the accusative form. Starosta (1999) also gives dobrych as an alternative animate accusative plural, although Stone (1993: 630) states that animacy is not relevant in the plural except in highly restricted contexts.
4. For a discussion of Pāṇini style inference in the history of linguistic analysis, see Gisborne and Hippisley (2017).
5. Corbett (2012a: 24) argues that superclassing is different from syncretism since a speaker always has a choice available that is not restricted by syntactic domain.
7. See Forker (2014) for an explicit comparison of multivariate typology and Canonical Typology.

References


Starosta, Manfred (1999), *Dolnoserbsko-nimski słownik* [Lower Sorbian–German dictionary], Bautzen: Domowina.


